MAY 1963

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

Special Issue

VOL. 15

1

THE SPLIT IN THE SOCIALIST WORLD

American Radicalism: Further Discussion

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME FIFTEEN NUMBER ONE MAY 1963

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: *The Split in the Socialist World* 1
THE COMMUNIST SCHISM IN THE OUTSKIRTS OF THE WORLD
by Eduardo H. Galeano 21
THE COUPS IN IRAQ AND SYRIA by Tabitha Petran 31
AMERICAN RADICALISM: FURTHER DISCUSSION
by James Weinstein, Dominic Mascio, Abraham Unger, Milt Bloch 40
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 56
WHERE WE STAND by The Editors 62

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright, ©1963, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, New York.
Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$6 in the U.S.; $7 foreign.
By 1st class mail—U.S. $9; everywhere else $11.
By air mail—No. America $11; So. America and Europe $15; Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $17.

EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

As subscribers in the New York area already know, Sir Leslie Plummer, who was to have spoken at an MR Associates meeting on April 24th, was the victim of a stroke shortly after arriving in this country on April 15th. His untimely death, on the eve of a victory for the Labor Party in whose government he would undoubtedly have held a high post, is a tragic loss. We extend our sympathy to Lady Plummer and to his many friends in the international socialist movement.

We have only 28 copies of the January, 1963, issue remaining in stock and would like to ask all readers who still have their copies but do not intend to keep them permanently to send them to us. In exchange, we will send any two MR pamphlets of your choice.

The reason for the extraordinary run on the January issue is the Review of the Month on the Sino-Indian border dispute and Carlos Fuentes' article, "The Argument of Latin America." Many readers have written asking us to reprint the Fuentes article as a separate pamphlet. We are doing better. A collection of a dozen of the best articles MR has run on Latin America will be published as a book in the very near future. Entitled *Whither Latin America?,* the book will sell at a price of $1.45 in a paperback edition. But until official publication date (some time in June), we are offering it at the special price of $1.00 a copy or $5.00 for six copies. The corresponding prices for the cloth edition are $3.00 list and $2.00 prepublication. For table of contents, see the back cover. May

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SPLIT IN THE SOCIALIST WORLD

The Review of the Month in the December, 1961, issue of MR was on the subject of the Sino-Soviet dispute. Since then a lot has happened, and a large amount of new or previously relatively inaccessible material has been published.* In the light of these developments, we have to say quite frankly that our earlier analysis of the dispute does not stand up. It contains serious inaccuracies, the emphases are misplaced, and it now seems to us that the conclusions are untenable. But much more serious, the whole argument rested on a misconception of what the dispute is all about.

What the Dispute Is About

It is not about whether war is inevitable or how to minimize the danger of war or what the relations among Communist Parties should be—though these and many other questions are involved. At bottom it is about the nature of the historical period through which the world is passing and what can and should be done to advance the cause of world socialism.

The Russians and those who agree with them (including the leadership of most of the non-Asian Communist Parties) think that the over-riding issue of our time is war or peace, and

* The following sources are particularly valuable: (1) Donald S. Zagoria, *The Sino-Soviet Conflict, 1956-1961,* Princeton, 1962. This book quotes from or summarizes the most important documents on both sides from the 20th Congress through the 22nd Congress of the CPUSSR. (2) Edgar Snow, *The Other Side of the River: Red China Today,* New York, 1962. This 810-page work, perhaps the best general account of revolutionary China to date, throws valuable light on the motivations and ideas of the Chinese leaders. (3) The following statements published by the Chinese CP: "The Differences between Comrade Togliatti and Us," *Renmin Ribao,* December 31, 1962; "Whence the Differences: A Reply to Thorez and Other Comrades," *Renmin Ribao,* February 27, 1963; and "More on the Differences between Comrade Togliatti and Us: Some Important Problems of Leninism in the Contemporary World," *Hongqi,* March 4, 1963. The last named is in fact a book of 199 pages which contains a detailed and authoritative statement of Chinese views. All of these, as well as other statements on the dispute, have been published

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that by comparison everything else is of secondary importance. If thermonuclear war comes, they argue, civilization itself will be destroyed or at any rate set back hundreds if not thousands of years, and the bright future which now seems to beckon the socialist countries will be ruined. On the other hand if war can be avoided, the superiority of socialism over capitalism will be clearly demonstrated within a decade or two and the whole world will be irresistibly attracted into the socialist camp.

The political line which follows from this analysis puts primary emphasis on three objectives: peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, disarmament, and peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism. These are treated—for example, in the new program of the CPUSSR adopted at the 22nd Congress in October, 1961—not merely as desirable but as actually attainable goals. This is a crucially important distinction which must be continuously kept in mind. The dispute in the socialist camp concerns not the desirability of these goals but their attainability, and attainability depends on reality not on wishes.

War and Imperialism

The Chinese, for their part, are emphatic in their espousal of a policy of peaceful coexistence. "The Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese government," we read in the first reply to Togliatti, "have always stood for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems." (*Differences,* p. 22.) And again: "A socialist country has no antagonistic social contradictions . . . and it is absolutely unnecessary and impermissible for a socialist country to embark on wars of expansion. No world war can ever be started by a socialist country." (*More on the Differences,* p. 66.) But they are no less emphatic in their insistence that imperialism does not stand for peaceful coexistence, that imperialism is full of antagonistic social con-

separately by the Foreign Languages Press, Peking. In what follows, references are to these separate editions, identified by short titles. On the Soviet side, many articles and speeches could be cited. Perhaps the best single source is Khrushchev's speech to the Supreme Soviet on December 12, 1962, entitled "The Present International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union," published as a separate pamphlet by Cross-currents Press, New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tradictions, that it is in the nature of imperialism to embark on wars of expansion, and that imperialism can start a world war. These are, indeed, among the most basic tenets of Leninism, and they have been fully confirmed by history. Imperialist conflict has already been responsible for starting two world wars, and "the history of the 17 postwar years shows that local wars of one kind or another have never ceased." (*Differences,* p. 25.) In the three years 1960-1962 alone, the Chinese enumerate some 20 local wars or acts of imperialist aggression. (*More on the Differences,* pp. 60-63.) The conclusion follows with iron logic that "only after the imperialist system has been overthrown and only after all systems of oppression of man by man and of exploitation of man by man have been abolished, and not before, will it be possible to eliminate all wars and to reach 'a world without war.' " (*Differences,* p. 25.) To believe otherwise is not Leninism but bourgeois pacifism.

This does not mean the Chinese think that a third world war is inevitable, still less that the world is going to be blown up in a thermonuclear holocaust. On these questions, as distinct from banning war altogether, they are even quite optimistic. Their reasoning, reduced to its essentials, is that just as the first two world wars resulted in vast losses of territory and population to imperialism, so a third world war would finish the job, wiping imperialism off the face of the earth. If the forces opposed to imperialism and war can be effectively mobilized and the imperialists can be convinced that to start another world war would be suicide, they can be deterred from doing it. With respect to atomic warfare, the Chinese hold that since "the secret of nuclear weapons has long since ceased to be a monopoly," it follows that "those who possess nuclear weapons and guided missiles cannot prevent other countries from possessing the same. In their vain hope of obliterating their opponents with nuclear weapons, the imperialists are, in fact, subjecting themselves to the danger of being obliterated." Therefore, "we have always maintained that it is possible to conclude an agreement for a total ban on nuclear weapons." (*More on the Differences,* p. 73.) And they call attention to the fact that "there are precedents for the outlawing of highly destructive weapons. One such precedent is the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, concluded by various nations in 1925 at Geneva." (*Differences,* pp. 13-14.) But of course the possibility of avoiding a third world war or of outlawing nuclear weapons is an entirely different matter from banning war altogether. That will be possible only after imperialism has been completely eliminated.

To be sure, if the nature of imperialism had changed or if it were in the process of changing, this conclusion would no longer hold. But the Chinese contend that the changes which have taken place in imperialism, and in particular the decline of the old colonial empires, have in no way changed the nature of the beast. The United States has stepped into the shoes of the formerly dominant imperialist powers and "is carrying out a policy of expansion in all parts of the world ever since World War II." (*More on the Differences,* p. 27.) But this in no way affects the contradictions of the system. On the contrary:

> The U.S. imperialist policy of world hegemony inevitably intensifies the fight between the imperialist powers and between the new and old colonialists over colonies and spheres of influence; it also intensifies the struggles between U.S. imperialism with its policy of control and the other imperialist powers which are resisting this control. These struggles affect the vital interests of imperialism, and the imperialist contestants give each other no quarter, for each side is striving to strangle the other.
>
> The policy of the U.S. imperialists and their partners towards the oppressed nations and people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America who are struggling for their own liberation is an extremely reactionary policy of suppression and deception. . . .
>
> The population of these areas in Asia, Africa, and Latin America constitutes more than two thirds of the total population of the capitalist world. The ever-mounting tide of revolution in these areas and the fight over them between the imperialist powers and between the new and old colonialists clearly show that these areas are the focus of all the contradictions of the capitalist world; it may also be said that they are the focus of world contradictions. These areas are the weakest link in the imperialist chain and the storm center of world revolution.* (*Ibid.,* pp. 31-32.)

* It is important to understand that in saying that "these areas are the focus of world contradictions," the Chinese definitely mean to include the contradictions between the capitalist and socialist systems. "In terms

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Chances of Disarmament

In these circumstances, the Chinese evidently think that the prospects of any genuine disarmament are vanishingly small, so small indeed that they hardly bother to discuss the problem at all. In *More on the Differences between Comrade Togliatti and Us,* which is unquestionably their major theoretical pronouncement, disarmament is brought up at only one place in the chapter on "War and Peace" and is quickly disposed of:

> That old-line opportunist Kautsky held that "war is a product of the arms drive," and that "if there is a will to reach agreement on disarmament," it "will eliminate one of the most serious causes of war." Lenin sharply criticized these anti-Marxist views of Kautsky and other old-line opportunists who examined the causes of war without reference to the social system and the system of exploitation.
>
> In "The War Program of the Proletarian Revolution," Lenin pointed out that "only *after* the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world-historical mission, to throw all armaments on the scrap heap; and the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but *only when this condition has been fulfilled, certainly not before.*" Such is the law of social development, and it cannot be otherwise.
>
> Being incapable of explaining the question of war and peace from the historical and class angle, the modern revisionists always talk about peace and about war in general terms without making any distinction between just and unjust wars. Some people are trying to persuade others that the people's liberation would be "incomparably easier" after general and complete disarmament, when the oppressors would have no weapons in their hands. In our opinion this is nonsensical and totally unrealistic and is putting the cart before the horse.* (*Ibid.,* pp. 67-68. Emphasis in original.)

---

of the actual interests of the imperialist powers," they say in another passage, "these contradictions [in Asia, Africa, and Latin America] are more pressing, more direct, more immediate than their contradictions with the socialist countries." *Ibid.,* p. 50.

* The reference may be to Soviet First Deputy Premier Mikoyan who was reported in the *New York Times* of March 15, 1962, as saying in a speech in Armenia that he "rejected the thesis that Mr. Khrushchev's disarmament proposals would hamper the national liberation movements. The Deputy Premier . . . said that disarmament would strip the 'imperialists' of the means of 'resisting the revolutionary actions of the proletariat and the peasantry.'" This very consequence of disarmament serves to explain why, in the Chinese view, Mr. Khrushchev's proposals are "totally unrealistic."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This low estimate of the chances of disarmament does not mean that the Chinese oppose the socialist countries' taking the initiative in proposing disarmament: not to do so would be to abandon an effective propaganda weapon. But the Chinese evidently believe that to rely on disarmament as a means of promoting or insuring peace makes no sense. The threat of war comes not from armaments as such but from imperialism and can be countered only by fighting imperialism. Hence where the Soviet Union's political line centers on the struggle for peace and disarmament, that of the Chinese centers on the struggle against imperialism.

How to Fight Imperialism

How should the struggle against imperialism be carried on? The Chinese answer that it must be conducted on all levels and by all available methods. But since, as we have seen, they regard the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America as "the weakest link in the imperialist chain," they naturally conclude that the key to a successful fight against imperialism is to be found in the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of those areas. Since this is the real heart of the Chinese position and the central issue in their dispute with the Soviet Union, a full statement of their views seems called for:

> A fundamental task is thus set before the international Communist movement in the contemporary world, namely, to support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, because these struggles are decisive for the cause of the international proletariat as a whole. In a sense, the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat as a whole hinges on the outcome of the people's struggles in these regions, which are inhabited by the overwhelming majority of the world's population, as well as on the acquisition of support from these revolutionary struggles.
>
> The revolutionary struggles in Asia, Africa, and Latin America cannot be suppressed. They are bound to burst forth. Unless the proletarian parties in these regions lead these struggles, they will become divorced from the people and fail to win their confidence. The proletariat has very many allies in the anti-imperialist struggle in these regions. Therefore . . . the proletariat and its vanguard . . . must march in the van . . . and be skillful in organizing their allies in a broad anti-imperialist and anti-feudal united front, exposing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every deception practiced by the imperialists, the reactionaries, and the modern revisionists, and leading the struggle in the correct direction. Unless all these things are done, victory in the revolutionary struggle will be impossible, and even if victory is won, its consolidation will be impossible and the fruits of victory may fall into the hands of the reactionaries, with the country and the nation once again coming under imperialist enslavement. Experience, past and present, abounds in instances of how the people have been betrayed in the revolutionary struggle, the defeat of the Chinese Revolution in 1927 being a significant example.

The proletariat of the capitalist countries in Europe and America, too, must stand in the forefront of those supporting the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In fact, such support simultaneously helps the cause of the emancipation of the proletariat in Europe and America. . . . Therefore the proletarian parties of the metropolitan imperialist countries are duty bound to heed the voice of the revolutionary people in these regions, study their experience, respect their revolutionary feelings, and support their revolutionary struggles. . . . It should be understood that according to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, without a correct stand, line, and policy on the national liberation movement and the people's revolutionary movement in the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, it will be impossible for the workers' parties in the metropolitan imperialist countries to have a correct stand, line, and policy on the struggle waged by the working class and the broad masses of the people in their own countries.

The national liberation movement and the people's revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa, and Latin America give great support to the socialist countries; they constitute an extremely important force safeguarding the socialist countries from imperialist invasion. Beyond any doubt, the socialist countries should give warm sympathy and active support to these movements and they absolutely must not adopt a perfunctory or a selfishly national attitude, or an attitude of great-power chauvinism, much less hamper, obstruct, mislead, or sabotage these movements. Those countries in which socialism has been victorious must make it their sacred internationalist duty to support the national liberation struggles and the people's revolutionary struggles in other countries. Some people take the view that such support is but a one-sided "burden" on the socialist countries. This view is very wrong and runs counter to Marxism-Leninism. It must be understood that such support is a two-way, mutual affair; the socialist countries support the people's revolutionary struggles in other countries, and these struggles in turn serve to support and defend the socialist countries. (*More on the Differences,* pp. 45-47.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Revolutionary movements in the underdeveloped countries thus constitute the crucial factor in the all-important struggle against imperialism. Proletarian parties must correctly lead these movements so as to prevent the kind of disastrous setback the Chinese Revolution suffered in 1927. The Left in the capitalist countries must understand and support these movements. And finally the socialist countries must provide them with all possible backing, not only as a matter of international solidarity but because this is the best way of weakening their own mortal enemy. As to the outlook, the Chinese are full of revolutionary optimism. "The present situation," they say, "is an excellent one for the people of the world. It is most favorable for the oppressed nations and people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, for the proletariat and working people of the capitalist countries, for the socialist countries, and for the cause of world peace; it is unfavorable only for the imperialists and the reactionaries in all countries and for the forces of aggression and war." (*More on the Differences,* pp. 48-49.) The Chinese Communists carried out a successful fight of their own against imperialism and reactionaries despite seemingly insuperable odds; they believe that conditions are now much more favorable and that similar victories can be won by the other oppressed and exploited peoples of the world.

Peaceful Competition and Peaceful Transition

Nothing in all this should be taken to imply that the Chinese deny or minimize the importance of socialist successes in the economic competition with capitalism as a factor in promoting the world revolution. They stress that "the superiority of the socialist system as demonstrated in the socialist countries is a source of great inspiration to the oppressed people and nations," and quote Lenin approvingly as saying that "it is by our economic policy that we are exerting our main influence on the international revolution." They then go on to say, however:

> But Lenin never said that the building of a Soviet state could take the place of the struggles of all countries to liberate themselves. Historical events during the 40 years and more of the Soviet Union's existence also show that a revolution or a transformation of the social system in any country is a matter for the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people of that country, and that the policy of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition followed by socialist countries cannot possibly result in a change of the social system in any other country. What grounds have Togliatti and other comrades for believing that the pursuit of the policy of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition by the socialist countries can change the face of the social system in every other country and establish an "economic and social order" capable of satisfying all the aspirations of men? (*More on the Differences,* p. 17.)

The Chinese position, in other words, is that peaceful competition may spur revolutions in the nonsocialist countries but can never be a substitute for them.

What about the possibilities of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism? The Chinese subscribed to the Moscow Declaration (1957) and the Moscow Statement (1960) of the world's Communist Parties, both of which documents assert the possibility of such a peaceful transition; but it is apparent that they do not have very high hopes in this regard and that they consider exclusive reliance on peaceful methods of struggle to be dangerous in the extreme. "It would naturally be in the interests of the proletariat and the entire people if peaceful transition could be realized," they say. But "possibility and reality, the wish and its fulfillment, are two different things." Moreover, up to now, "history has not witnessed a single example of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism." Still more important:

> Even when it is possible to secure state power through peaceful means, one must be prepared to deal immediately with armed intervention by foreign imperialists and with counter-revolutionary armed rebellions supported by the imperialists. Communists should concentrate their attention on the accumulation of revolutionary strength through painstaking efforts and must be ready to fight back against armed attacks by the bourgeoisie whenever necessary. They should not lay one-sided stress on peaceful transition and concentrate their attention on this possibility; otherwise they are bound to benumb the revolutionary will of the proletariat, disarm themselves ideologically, be utterly passive and unprepared politically and organizationally, and end up by burying the cause of the proletarian revolution. (*Differences,* pp. 35-36.)

In the final analysis, then, the question of peaceful transition is seen to involve the struggle against imperialism. This is the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

starting point and the ending point of every meaningful discussion of socialist policy in the world of today. But can a militant struggle against imperialism, such as the Chinese advocate and support, be carried out without provoking a third world war with all its catastrophic consequences?

Nuclear Weapons and Paper Tigers

The Chinese answer to this question is not spelled out in any detail. They simply say, in effect, that the struggle against imperialism helps to defend peace, not to provoke war. Presumably some such reasoning as the following underlies this belief. Nuclear weapons are totally irrelevant to the combatting of guerrilla war and other forms of popular struggle, and these are bound to be the main forms of conflict between imperialism and the revolutionary forces in the underdeveloped countries. And the Dulles doctrine of "massive retaliation" against the socialist countries because of their moral and/or material support of the revolutionaries is a recipe for suicide. Even Dulles himself was unable to persuade the U.S. government to apply the doctrine at the time of Dienbienphu, and with the power of the socialist countries to retaliate against any attack on them growing all the time, the doctrine is still less likely to be applied in the future. In the meantime, the revolutionary struggle weakens imperialism by liberating one country after another, a process which intensifies all the contradictions of the system and will eventually set the stage for its overthrow in the metropolitan centers themselves.

This reasoning might seem to imply that the socialist countries can afford to go to any lengths to support revolutionary struggles in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; and the Chinese are in fact accused by their opponents of taking this position. In order to evaluate this accusation, one must understand and take account of two well publicized Chinese doctrines—"despise the enemy strategically, take him seriously tactically" and "imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers."

The "paper tiger" doctrine is really nothing but a metaphorical way of stating one of the most elementary and least controversial propositions of orthodox Marxism, that the decline

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of capitalism and its replacement by socialism on a world scale are both inevitable. In an historical sense, therefore, the defenders of the capitalist system are powerless, they are paper tigers. And this is the enemy which should be despised strategically, the term "strategically" in this context meaning both "in the long run" and "as a whole." Taken together, the "despise the enemy strategically" and "paper tiger" doctrines are thus simply the Chinese way of saying what Marxists have been saying to the downtrodden and exploited for a long time: do not be overawed and cowed by the apparent might of your oppressors; their fate has already been sealed by history; join the battle now and hasten their downfall and your own liberation.

Man-eating Tigers

All of this, however, has nothing to do with the actual conduct of the battle, the "tactical" aspect in the Chinese terminology. Here there are no paper tigers to be despised. Everything in the world, according to Mao Tse-tung, has a dual nature. "Imperialism and all reactionaries, looked at in essence, from a long-term point of view, from a strategic point of view, must be seen for what they are—paper tigers." But this is only one side of their nature. "On the other hand, they are also living tigers, iron tigers, real tigers which can eat people." (*More on the Differences,* p. 141, quoting Mao.) And these real man-eating tigers are the ones that have to be fought against in everyday battle. Hence the principle: Take the enemy seriously tactically.

What this means in more concrete terms of course depends on particular circumstances. But it is certainly no recipe for irresponsible adventurism, and the record shows that the Chinese have been as cautious as any other major power in their conduct of foreign relations. While claiming their undoubted legal right to liberate Taiwan, they have taken no military steps to do so and have even refrained from occupying the offshore islands despite their use as sabotage and espionage bases; they have tolerated the colonies of Hong Kong and Macao on Chinese soil, waiting to solve these problems "until the time is ripe"; repeated charges in the U.S. press of Chinese military inter-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vention in Laos and Vietnam seem to be without foundation;* and farther away from home, in Algeria and Cuba for example, the Chinese have given their full moral support to revolutionary forces and have provided as much economic aid as they could manage but have been careful to avoid actions which could be considered provocative. At the same time, where they have felt that China itself was directly menaced or attacked, as in North Korea in 1950 and on the Indian border from 1959 on, the Chinese have not hesitated to strike back hard in self-defense.

But what about the Chinese attitude in the Cuban crisis of last October? Was that not provocative? If China instead of the Soviet Union had been pitted against the United States, is there not a good chance that the world would already have gone up in thermonuclear flames? The Chinese answer to these questions is an emphatic negative. In the first place, they were strongly opposed to the introduction of missiles into Cuba; in their view, it was an adventurist act which simply played into the hands of the United States imperialists. The real deterrents to a U.S. attack on Cuba must be the will of the Cuban people to fight to the death, the condemnation of world opinion, the wrath of Latin America; and with respect to these deterrents the missiles could not but do more harm than good. In the second place, the Chinese were definitely not opposed to removing the missiles. What they *were* against was removing the missiles without consulting the Cubans, and agreeing to unilateral inspection by the UN—in short, they were against making a deal with imperialism at the expense of another nation's sovereignty. There is nothing in all this to indicate an adventurist or warlike policy on the part of the Chinese. On the contrary, it is clear

* This particular accusation has been made so often and so emphatically that it may be as well to quote a person who should know the facts if anyone should and who certainly has no motive to cover up for the Chinese. In a press conference in Saigon recently, General Paul D. Harkins, head of the U. S. military forces in South Vietnam, briefed reporters on the situation in South Vietnam. According to the account in the *Washington Post* (March 6): "Harkins said the guerrillas obviously are not being reinforced or supplied systematically from North Vietnam, China, or any place else. He said they apparently depend for weapons primarily on whatever they can capture. Many of their weapons, he said, are homemade."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that if Mao had been in Khrushchev's place there would have been no missile crisis to begin with, and the Cuban crisis, if it had occurred, would have taken a quite different form.

Reform vs. Revolution

There is one other issue which has figured prominently in the polemics between the Chinese and their opponents, the question of "structural reform" versus proletarian revolution for the countries of advanced capitalism. For anyone who has read the literature of previous "great debates" between reformists and revolutionaries, especially Lenin's famous tracts of 1917 and 1918, *State and Revolution* and *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky,* this new exchange has a very familiar sound. Just as Lenin in his day saw it as his first duty to revive and restate the true doctrines of Marx on the then burning issues of state and revolution, so now the Chinese see it as their responsibility to recall to the "modern revisionists" what Lenin himself said and stood for and to demonstrate that their "new" ideas are really not new at all and are as much at odds with the ideas of Marx and Lenin as were Kautsky's a half century ago. This is not the place for a discussion of the theory of "structural reform" now being propounded by Togliatti (as well as by various other, Communist and non-Communist, theorists in Western Europe). For present purposes, it is enough to point out that the Chinese position on the questions at issue is strictly orthodox Marxism-Leninism.

The Mantle of Lenin

One can, indeed, go further and say that on the whole range of subjects under dispute between the two sides, the Chinese arguments are purely Leninist in spirit even if not always in form (tigers, real or paper, are after all not a Russian specialty). The Russians and their followers, by comparison, are undoubtedly the modern revisionists the Chinese describe them as. And this accounts for one of the most striking aspects of the whole controversy.

For reasons which we can only touch on here, Khrushchev and his associates have a great need to wear the ideological mantle of Lenin. By brusquely dethroning Stalin, they breached

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the continuity of Soviet development and in a sense called into question the legitimacy of their own leadership. They therefore need to reach back, as it were, and attempt to establish a more basic continuity by showing that they are the real heirs of Lenin while Stalin was a sort of impostor. The Khrushchevian style is thus to pay homage to Lenin whenever a suitable opportunity presents itself, while relegating Stalin to a limbo of silence even in respect to matters where he was a faithful disciple of Lenin or where the weight of his authority might be most useful to Khrushchev.

Now along come the Chinese with their overwhelming proof that Khrushchev's ideas and the political line he bases on them are not Leninist at all and in fact have more in common with the ideas and line of the people on whom Lenin focused his attacks just before and after the Soviet state was born. If Khrushchev and his associates could answer the Chinese and make out a plausible case that they and not the Chinese are the true interpreters of Lenin, that would be one thing. But this would obviously be a hopeless undertaking: any rational debate with the Chinese could only do more harm than good. The result is a good deal of misrepresentation and distortion of the Chinese position. The Chinese are accused of wanting to advance the cause of socialism through world war, of advocating and practicing adventurist foreign policies, of stirring up premature revolts, of ignorance of conditions outside their own country, and so on and so forth. All of these charges are false, as anyone who knows the history of the recent past and takes the trouble to read the relevant Chinese literature can easily verify. In order to keep their own people from learning the truth of the matter, the Soviet leadership is therefore forced to suppress the replies of the Chinese to the accusations made against them. The contrast between the Chinese policy of publishing both sides of the debate and the Russian policy of publishing only one side tells a great deal about the debate itself.* "Since you are quite

* One of the saddest features of the situation is the extent to which able leaders like Khrushchev and Togliatti, not to mention lesser figures, have thrown dialectical and historical materialism to the winds and have put in its place the most commonplace kind of pragmatism. But this is too large a subject to discuss within the framework of the present paper.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

definite that our articles are wrong," say the Chinese to their opponents, "why don't you publish all these erroneous articles and then refute them point by point, so as to inculcate hatred among your people against the 'heresies' you call dogmatism, sectarianism, and anti-Marxism-Leninism? Why do you lack the courage to do this? Why such a stringent embargo? You fear the truth." (*More on the Differences,* p. 194.) It is, alas, hard to think of another reason.

Relations among Communist Parties

The controversy of course involves the question of relations among Communist parties. Even in the days of the Third International when no member party would have dreamed of openly challenging Soviet leadership, the Chinese were quietly going their own way; and after the Second World War they directly defied Stalin's advice to enter a coalition dominated by Chiang Kai-shek. As Stalin himself later admitted, they were right and he was wrong. As a result of these experiences, the Chinese are used to being in a minority and have never been under the spell of the doctrine of Soviet infallibility, facts which help to explain their present stand. All Communist parties, in the Chinese view, are equal and none can presume to dictate to others. This does not exclude a party's voluntarily following the "baton" if it wants to (the "baton" is their euphemism for the Soviet line), but none is obliged to. The only line binding on all parties is that laid down in documents such as the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement to which all have put their signatures. (Since each party interprets these documents as it wishes, it is clear that in practice the commitment to abide by them means little.) The Russians, on the other hand, while they have given up any claim to exclusive leadership, argue that all parties ought to accept the views of the majority. This the Chinese deny, supporting their position with one of the classical doctrines of bourgeois democracy. What matters, they say, is not a majority but the truth; a minority which takes a principled stand for the truth will in due course become a majority. For their part, they have not the slightest doubt that they represent the truth and that time is on their side. As for the modern revisionists who are betraying Marxism-Leninism, "Let them go on creating trouble

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if they must. The masses, and history, will pass judgment on them." (*More on the Differences,* p. 193.)

The Causes of Revisionism

On the main issue in the controversy—whether the struggle for peace or the struggle against imperialism should take priority—we are convinced that the Chinese do indeed have the truth on their side. Real peace will never be achieved, much less guaranteed, as long as imperialism exists. And we are also convinced that the Chinese are right that imperialism can and will suffer decisive defeats at the hands of the revolutionary peoples of the underdeveloped countries. We are by no means so sure as the Chinese seem to be, however, that the fact of their being right on these crucial questions means that sooner or later the whole international socialist movement will come around to their position. It is impossible to form a worthwhile opinion about this without an understanding of the causes of modern revisionism, and here unfortunately the Chinese have little to offer.

Revisionism, according to the Chinese, is "bourgeois ideology which has infiltrated into the ranks of the workers." (*More on the Differences,* p. 4.) And the vehicle for this infiltration is the aristocracy of labor: "Revisionism represents the interests of the labor aristocracy, and hence also the interests of the reactionary bourgeoisie." But all forms of revisionism "run counter to the interests of the proletariat, of the masses of the people, and of all oppressed people and nations." Therefore:

> One after the other, all the revisionists and opportunists who challenged revolutionary Marxism-Leninism have collapsed in the face of the truth and have been spurned by the people. . . . Those who are launching the new attacks on revolutionary Marxism-Leninism today are just as overbearing and arrogant; yet, if they continue to turn a deaf ear to all advice and persist in their wrong course, it can be said for certain that their end will be no better than that of the old revisionists and opportunists. (*Ibid.,* pp. 192-193.)

This theory of revisionism is, like Chinese Communist thought in general, pure Leninism. But unlike most of Lenin's ideas, it has failed to stand the test of time. Lenin tried to use

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the theory to explain Social Democratic attitudes and policies in his day: he regarded Social Democracy as the creation of a small labor aristocracy which managed to attract a mass following through deceit and demagogy. This became the basis of the policies of Communist Parties in all the countries where Social Democracy was strong. But these policies never worked, for the simple reason that the Social Democrats and not the Communists expressed what the workers themselves felt to be their real interests. The workers, in other words, were not revolutionaries at heart, and no amount of exhortation by the Communists could turn them into revolutionaries. Gradually, the Communist parties, though continuing to use revolutionary phraseology, adjusted themselves to this fact, becoming in practice reformist parties much like the Social Democrats. What is happening now, with Togliatti and the Italian CP in the lead, is simply that the Communist parties of the advanced capitalist countries are taking the last step along this road by openly embracing a reformist ideology.

But this is not the only respect in which the Chinese theory of revisionism falls down. After all, the fountainhead of "modern revisionism" is not Togliatti, nor is it Tito, even if the Chinese often accord the latter pride of place; it is Khrushchev and his fellow-leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Does it make sense to speak of bourgeois influence penetrating the ranks of the Soviet workers through a labor aristocracy? Should we not rather conclude that if this theory is wrong as applied to the advanced capitalist countries, it is simply irrelevant as applied to the Soviet Union? Perhaps the Chinese have answers to these questions; and if so, we would be interested to know what they are. In the meantime, we can ask what other possible causes there may be for revisionism in the Soviet Union.

The most plausible answer seems to be that the Soviet people are no more revolutionary than the workers of the advanced capitalist countries, though for different reasons. It is not that they have shared as junior partners in the exploitation of a dependent empire, but rather that they have already made their revolution, have successfully defended it in violent struggles, and have laid the foundations of a rapid advance to higher standards of living. What they want now is a long period of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peace and quiet in which to get on with the business in hand. They want peaceful coexistence and disarmament, and they are more than willing to believe that their own successes in building socialism will persuade the whole world to follow in their footsteps. The pressure on leaders to tell the Soviet people that these are attainable goals and to orient the country's policies accordingly would seem to be a sufficient explanation of what has been happening. Marxism-Leninism is in its essence, as the Chinese correctly insist, a revolutionary doctrine addressed to the oppressed and exploited of the world. How can it be expected to appeal to people who are not oppressed or exploited and who have no need of a revolution?

As for the Communist parties in the advanced capitalist countries, they represent or seek to represent working classes which, objectively speaking, do share as junior partners in the exploitation of dependent empires. These parties either have to adopt policies which are acceptable to their own workers or else go into the political wilderness, perhaps for a long time to come. It can be argued, and we think correctly, that it is better to take the latter course, to begin now to prepare for the day when imperialism in decline once again creates the conditions for vigorous revolutionary movements in even the richest capitalist countries. But no one should be surprised if established political parties and leaders seek to maintain their positions even at the expense of their time-honored principles. Under the circumstances, the apparent paradox of Communists who are also revisionists and reformists is seen to be really no paradox at all.

Some Conclusions

If this analysis is on the right track, it suggests the following general conclusions:

First, Marxism-Leninism is as much as ever, perhaps even more than ever, the appropriate ideology for the oppressed and exploited majority of mankind. The Chinese as its most faithful and powerful champions seem certain to become the spiritual leaders of all genuine revolutionary movements in the world. In this sense, a new International is in the making, and it gives every sign of being the biggest and most revolutionary of all the internationals to date. (The strong leaning of Latin American

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolutionaries to the Chinese side, for example, can be clearly read in Eduardo Galeano's article which begins on page 21 of this issue.)

Second, the International that groups together the Soviet Union, the socialist countries of Eastern Europe, and the Communist parties in the advanced capitalist countries seems unlikely either to disintegrate or change its nature in the visible future. Thus what has for more than forty years been an ideologically and politically united world Communist movement seems on the way to a deep and lasting split.

What is the relation between the two Communist Internationals likely to be? It is much too early to expect to be able to give anything like a definitive answer to this crucially important question, but at any rate some of the relevant considerations can be indicated.

There are many good reasons why the two Internationals should agree to disagree on ideological questions while at the same time maintaining correct relations and cooperating economically and militarily. Neither group harbors expansionist designs in the manner of imperialism, and both are menaced by imperialism. In addition, all members of both groups can gain through the planned development of the international division of labor on an ever wider scale. Objective conditions, therefore, would seem to favor the working out of a modus vivendi on mutually advantageous terms.

On the other hand, it must be recognized that such an outcome is by no means assured. The Great Debate has not taken place entirely in the realm of polite (or not-so-polite) discourse. The abrupt withdrawal of Soviet technicians from China in 1960 was deeply resented by the Chinese; so also is the failure of the Russians to support the Chinese in their border conflict with India. Many revolutionaries around the world are developing a deep feeling of distrust toward Khrushchev and his associates, suspecting them of hankering for deals with the imperialists and blaming them, at least in part, for disastrous defeats such as that suffered last winter in Iraq. (On this, see the article by Tabitha Petran which begins on p. 31 below.) The Russians, on their side, unquestionably resent what they consider to be a grab by the Chinese for leadership of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world movement, and they will not meekly give up just because the Chinese have the better arguments. Other wounds and potential sources of conflict could be cited, but even this list is enough to show that there is no lack of fuel to feed the fires of ill-will and even hatred. It will take extraordinarily wise and cool leadership on both sides to prevent what is still only a dispute from degenerating into a mutually damaging and potentially disastrous fight. Whether such leadership exists or will be forthcoming, time alone will tell.

Meanwhile, those of us who are not already irrevocably committed to one side or the other and who have the interests of international socialism at heart can perhaps make a contribution, however small, by maintaining friendly relations with all groups concerned and urging upon them the desirability, nay the necessity, of maintaining a united front against imperialism, the real enemy of mankind.

(April 12, 1963)

Oppressed peoples in a less developed country, made desperate by tyranny and corruption, are not going to be deterred from getting rid of an objectionable government on the ground that it might upset the balance of power between the Great Powers. People struggling to free themselves from colonial oppression are going to get help wherever they can find it. People artificially divided in the interest of the balance of power are going to contrive to strive for reunification, and those suffering from racial discrimination are going to end it irrespective of the interests of those Powers.

—Dr. Nkrumah

The United States is the one society in which the philosophy of material progress is a spectacular success. Democracy is not inhibited, as it is in Europe, by either the threat of social upheaval from below or the memory of conservative past. But . . . political and social changes elsewhere worry most Americans. The revolt of the colonial people, who are in fact the ultimate heirs of 1776 . . . seems to be frightening and incomprehensible to the descendants of those who started it all at Lexington and Concord. . . .

—U Thant

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COMMUNIST SCHISM IN THE OUTSKIRTS OF THE WORLD

BY EDUARDO H. GALEANO

The end of February, the beginning of March. I open the daily newspapers and read that the Chinese attack Khrushchev. In reply, a friendly Nikita reaffirms his solidarity with China and Cuba against "the sharks of North American imperialism." *Red Flag* attacks again: "Atomic arms cannot change the laws that determine the development of mankind." In Havana, Juliao once again declares himself in favor of armed struggle and violence, while his compatriot Prestes, General Secretary of the Communist Party, emphasizes his confidence in peaceful coexistence. Juliao is the fierce enemy of Prestes and the presence of both of them in Havana (Prestes having come from Moscow) indicates, without too much use of imagination, that it has something to do with the ideological polemic which is dividing international Communism into two camps. It is not a bold assumption to suppose that Khrushchev also is fighting in Havana, perhaps with the arms of persuasion, against the Chinese thesis. If the pressure of Mao's revolution is obliging him to proclaim periodically the USSR's solidarity with the future of the international proletariat and particularly with China and Cuba, the explosive influence of Fidel Castro on Latin America has become for Nikita a double-edged sword which compromises, even while it provides, prestige.

Echoes of the October Crisis

Toward the middle of January of this year, Ulbricht's Party held its sixth Congress. There, in East Berlin, Nikita was hailed, while the speech given by Wu Hsiu-chuan, the Chinese delegate, was whistled at and greeted with cries of disapproval. What did Khrushchev say? He spoke long and

---

The author is one of the editors of *Marcha,* the political weekly published in Montevideo.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clearly to the 2,500 delegates of the different parties. He defended peaceful coexistence and called the Chinese thesis, without identifying it, "repelling." "That is the way witchdoctors and quacks act," he said. In regard to the crisis of October of last year, which placed the world on the edge of a third world war, he said that its outcome marked "a victory for the forces of peace, a victory for the forces of socialism, for the forces that are constructing communism." On that same day, many miles from Berlin, Fidel Castro said to the Women's Congress meeting in Cuba: ". . . the Caribbean crisis is not settled; I want to say that in our opinion, in the opinion of the revolutionary leadership of our country, a war was avoided, but peace was not won, which is not the same thing."

From Moscow's point of view, the October crisis was settled insofar as the missiles stopped an invasion which, according to all signs, was already under way. But Havana does not have the confidence in Kennedy's ambiguous promise that Moscow has. When Khrushchev announced on October 27 that the missiles would be dismantled, he established the fact that "the motives that impelled us to lend this kind of aid to Cuba have ceased to exist." And he went even farther: he told Kennedy that United Nations representatives could confirm the dismantling of the arms. Fidel Castro's reaction was not delayed; the next day he launched his five points, which state that

> the guarantees against an aggression against Cuba that Mr. Kennedy talks about will not exist unless, in addition to the elimination of the naval blockade which he promises, the following measures, among others, are taken: first, the end of the economic blockade and of all the commercial and economic pressure that the United States is exerting against our country throughout the world; second, the end of all subversive activities, of dropping and disembarking arms and explosives by air and by sea, of the organization of invasions by mercenaries, of the infiltration of spies and saboteurs, all actions which are carried out from the territory of the United States and of some countries which are its accomplices; third, the end of the pirate attacks which are carried out from bases in the United States and Puerto Rico; fourth, the end of all violations of our air and naval space by U.S. war planes and warships; fifth, withdrawal from the naval base of Guantánamo and the return of Cuban territory occupied by the United States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not a single one of the five conditions, in spite of the support Mikoyan promised a few days later, was accepted by Kennedy. The "guarantees," consequently, do not exist, according to the point of view of the Cuban Revolution, and the United Nations was not allowed to inspect the island.

As soon as the withdrawal of the missiles was announced, in the editorials of *People's Daily* and *Red Flag* Mao burst out with indignation: "We neither requested the installation of missile bases, nor do we oppose their dismantling. But we do oppose the sacrifice of the sovereignty of a country in connection with commitments made to imperialism. That is 100 percent conciliation, Munich pure and simple." Since the October crisis, Mao's attacks on Khrushchev have increased in intensity and frequency; the ideological war is today so hot that the Communists who operate within Moscow's sphere of influence can no longer deny that it exists, nor do they wish to. It is no longer a question of "bourgeois lies," simple calumnies to which no attention need be paid. Moscow is facing, every day more directly, a growing internal threat. Soviet hegemony over the international revolution has been challenged with unprecedented vigor, and observers ask themselves: will the Communist movement walk on *two* legs from now on?

At this point, the consequences of the division, formerly muted but today very loud, can be noticed by anyone. It is not difficult, for example, to find European Communists travelling through Latin America on official missions who talk about China as one does about an enemy country, and who do not hesitate to confess that Cuba gives them at one and the same time satisfactions and headaches.

Is Stalin's Shadow Growing?

The disagreements became public when, toward the middle of October of 1961, Khrushchev harshly attacked the Albanians in *his* Communist Party's Congress. Since then, most of the volleys have been fired over some other country: the bitter criticisms of Mao against Yugoslavia and of Nikita against Albania symbolize the hard-fought ideological battles between Peking and Moscow. This is why the Chinese have allied themselves with excommunicated Albania and with repudiated Stalin.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There can be no other explanation of the resurrection of Stalin's ghost in the land of the sons of Han. In order to deny all that Khrushchev's followers affirm, and vice versa, the Chinese have been obliged to light candles to the old, feared comrade. But the Chinese actually have few reasons to be grateful to him. Malraux has recalled, in the best of his novels, the bloody days of Shanghai in 1927 when unarmed Communists and militant workers were massacred and burned alive in locomotive boilers. Stalin had given them orders to hand over their arms to Chiang Kai-shek, in whom he saw the progressive expression of the Chinese bourgeoisie. The truth is that, in spite of his constant show of loyalty, Mao had undertaken an independent political path from the time of the Long March on. A high price in blood had been paid in Shanghai and Canton, a useless offering to the wavering of Stalinist politics. In his conversations with Djilas, the old wolf recognized this: "Here, when the war with Japan ended, we invited the Chinese comrades to reach an agreement for finding a *modus vivendi* with Chiang Kai-shek. They were verbally in agreement, but once they had returned to China they did as they pleased: they gathered their forces and attacked. It turned out that they were right and we were mistaken." Stalin's "mistakes" were very costly for the Communist movement all over the world, but they were not "mistakes." *The USSR still equates, in 1963, its national interests with those of the international revolution, and the tragedies occur when these interests do not coincide, or when they are opposed, even though it may be only circumstantially, and the contradiction explodes. Now as before, Mao is following an independent political line, but he is no longer in a position of inferiority. He speaks to Nikita as an equal, and his voice is the thunder of more than six hundred and fifty million voices.*

When the Chinese revindicate Stalin, they are not looking for ideological support in his memory, nor are they fulfilling a debt of gratitude. For long periods of time, Lenin's heir was the prophet of tame popular fronts, dedicated to peaceful reformist politics within capitalism without opposing imperialism. The Chinese, who suffered the consequences directly, must know how paradoxical it is to look to Stalin for support of their red revolutionary fury against Nikita's "weaknesses."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

War and Peace

What is going on, then? Let us separate the wheat from the chaff. Kennedy, Khrushchev, Thorez, and Togliatti all agree in affirming that "The Chinese want war." But is this true? What happened on the Himalayan border is a test case. Weren't the Chinese the aggressors against poor Nehru? Claude Cadart has shown in his brilliant articles that, contrary to what is generally supposed, the main responsibility for what occurred lies with the Indians. Before having recourse to arms, Mao exhausted the possibilities for peaceful negotiations, and even after the border guards had victoriously crossed the MacMahon line, the Chinese offered *for the twelfth time* to enter into direct negotiations to solve the conflict. They had shown their strength.

During the Himalayan crisis, Khrushchev chose neutrality. He didn't side either with the Chinese or the Indians; he just played deaf. However, on more than one occasion Nehru said that he could count on Soviet MIGs "to defend the threatened borders." The USSR continued giving economic aid to India, and relations between the two countries continued to be excellent. Relations had not been so good with China, however, for some time. In 1959 the Soviets tried to take control of the Chinese Communist Party through the intrigues of Peng Teh-huai, and toward the end of 1960 they cut off economic aid to Mao's regime. I have heard the eyewitness report of a traveler who has just returned from China and who has told me of blast furnaces which were standing idle because the technicians and capital, formerly supplied by the Russians, had been withdrawn.

I do not believe that the roots of the ideological war which has divided the Communist world can be found in a rivalry between *countries.* Of course, no one can deny the influence of China's special position, that of a young revolutionary giant harassed by hunger. It is enough to look at a map. Imperialism is lying in ambush in Japan, South Korea, Formosa, South Vietnam, Thailand. To the South, the doubtful neutrality of India; to the Southeast, Pakistan. The difficulties of a young revolution which has to face alone the problem of famine, explain why China has turned into *the most aggressive spokesman for the 1,700 million human beings who live in the outskirts*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the world, who don't have enough to eat and who hardly ever live for as long as thirty years. China is an anthill. Every second a new man is born, without bread, roof, or work. But precisely for this reason the Chinese are not speaking for themselves alone, and they know it. They say: "The revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples of Latin America, Asia, and Africa are decisive for the cause of the international proletariat as a whole" . . . "those who play a decisive role in wars are the peoples involved and not the differences in armaments." One of the last editorials in *Red Flag* says that "Atomic arms cannot change the laws that determine the development of mankind," which indicates the necessity of giving *total* aid to "the revolutionary movements in the third world . . . the Afro-Asiatic and Latin American masses, from the Occidental proletariats and the Socialist countries." This is the real reason, the basic cause of the disagreements. It is not that the Chinese want war, but that they will not allow the future of the peoples oppressed by imperialism in all of its forms, open or hidden, to be sacrificed on behalf of peace. On the contrary, they not only believe that the struggle for peace is part and parcel of the class war, but also that a policy of making concessions only sharpens the teeth of the "paper tiger." Encouraging the aggressiveness of imperialism increases rather than diminishes the danger of world war.

Tactics and Strategy

When the Cuba crisis occurred, Mao's press accused Nikita of being an "adventurer" because he sent missiles to the island. They felt that Khrushchev had forgotten *the tactical importance of peaceful coexistence.* At the same time the Chinese reproached the Soviet leaders for "capitulating" to Kennedy's demands, when the latter threatened to unleash a thermonuclear war. According to the *People's Daily,* the Soviets had lost sight of the fact that, *from the point of view of strategy, a permanent state of war exists between the imperialist and the Socialist countries.* The Chinese explain their benign attitude toward Formosa with "tactical" reasons, and they invoke reasons of "strategy" to accuse Khrushchev of cowardice.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The National Interests of the USSR

In reality, are there any grounds for speaking of "cowardice"? Peaceful coexistence is a national objective of the USSR, which, within its own borders, has gone beyond the passionate stage of revolution and is interested in creating the external and internal conditions which will allow it to *consolidate its prosperity.* This is why the Russians are sincere advocates of disarmament, which will provide resources enabling them to raise the standard of living of the people, produce more consumer goods and solve certain problems, such as their difficulties in agriculture and the housing shortage. The Soviet Union is today the second economic and military power in the world. It does not depend on the United States, nor does the United States depend on the Soviet Union. The Russians want peace in order to continue their development without tensions. Imperialism does not impose a life or death threat *to them.*

China's isolation from the world economy, on the other hand, has forced the sons of Han to struggle with all their might to pull their country up from its underdeveloped state. We must not forget that at the end of the Second World War the United States, England, and France poured almost 10,000 million dollars into that country, and that the relationship between China and the capitalist powers was the typical one of colony to mother country. The years have passed and despoiled imperialism has not forgiven. There is Chiang Kai-shek lurking in ambush, protected by the American Seventh Fleet, and there is economic pressure exerted in international markets and political pressure keeping China out of the United Nations.

In affirming unconditionally that there is a permanent state of war between the imperialist and the Socialist countries, the Chinese are not giving, as Marxists, the proper importance to the *differences in situation* that have been the very factors that provoked the schism. The war between the USA and the USSR is cold, or lukewarm at most; but the war between the United States and Cuba, for example, is a war of blood and fire, to the death. *In spite of the lulls in the struggle, in a historical perspective the triumph of the liberated colonies implies the annihilation of the centers of power.* The twentieth century has shown that capitalism's life is going to be much longer than

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was supposed a century ago, in the writings of the precursors. It is a matter, nevertheless, of "a dead man on leave," more or less pompous, but still condemned. Will a country like the United States, the owner of other countries, accept the insurrection of its colonies without fighting? The Chinese say that "history does not show a single example of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism. Those who no longer know the difference between just and unjust wars, have drifted toward bourgeois pacifist positions." And Fidel Castro: ". . . some crazy theoreticians have said that there was a peaceful transition in Cuba from capitalism to socialism . . . it was not a peaceful transition, it was a violent one . . . we do not deny the possibility of a peaceful transition, although we are still waiting for the first case of one." Whereas for Nikita Khrushchev: "A nuclear war would make the construction of a new society on the ruins that the conflict would leave in the world too difficult. After all, the workers do not want to die 'spectacularly,' but to construct a happy life."

In order to save the world from the hell of a third world war, Nikita has put in practice his doctrine of peaceful emulation, "to see who can best satisfy all the needs of Man." In accord with this conception, Socialist society will do all it can to offer capitalist society a kind of showcase of its progress. Gomulka, the Polish leader, answered thus the questions that Life magazine put to him and then did not publish: "If any people, the American people for example, does not want socialism and prefers capitalism, may they live under capitalism as long as they wish, even though it be a hundred years. This is the fundamental feature of peaceful coexistence between States. Each people ought to solve its own social problems alone. We proclaim that socialism is the best form of social organization and that it will triumph for that reason." If Marx were to come alive again, he would probably jump right back into his grave, frightened, at seeing this idealistic concept of history transformed into the official doctrine of the Communist world. In the interview I quoted, which took place in November of 1961, Gomulka foretold Nikita's attitude in the Cuban crisis of October, 1962. "Do you feel that the Soviet Union and its allies ought to cease sending arms to those elements ready to start fires in Laos,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vietnam and particularly Cuba?" "I am not only in favor of it, but I feel that, moreover, the ending of arms shipments to those countries mentioned, and also to those which were not mentioned, should not depend on previously reaching an agreement between East and West on partial disarmament or any other question which concerns diminishing the danger of a nuclear conflagration." The Communism of Nikita and his followers, for reasons that have their origin in the material situation of the Soviet Union, proposes, then, to outshine capitalism; the revolution will triumph *by virtue of its example and not by force of arms.* Without going so far, the Social Democrats were called "social traitors" and "lackeys of capitalism" by the Bolsheviks in the Second International, years ago. It is quite true that history is full of surprises.

The Limits of Nikita and Mao

But since, in spite of the marvels performed by his interpreters, Marx was right, it does not seem probable that capitalism will "understand" that it is a "worse" regime than socialism. The contradictions that are tearing it apart will burst forth. Can those who are always left behind be asked to keep waiting and waiting for their turn, until their enemy's corpse finally is carried off? Will the oppressed peoples sacrifice their revolution on the altar of peaceful coexistence?

Nikita Khrushchev is forced to navigate between two dangers. Stalin's heir, as brilliant a politician as can be found, knows that he cannot compromise the prestige of the Soviet Union before the international Communist movement, now that the Chinese have challenged his authority. The fear of losing power puts him in a difficult position every time that one of the points of friction in international politics becomes red hot. It happened in October in Cuba, and the outcome of the Caribbean crisis visibly favored his enemies, strengthened with the ammunition that his compromise with Kennedy gave them. In any case, it must be recognized that the Chinese are still very far from permitting themselves the luxury of carrying on their shoulders any other revolution besides their own. The struggle is hard enough for them as it is, and only at the cost of an inmense sacrifice can they give aid to Cuba, Algeria, or Albania.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is no less true that their catastrophic point of view on contemporary history leads them at times to exaggeration or sectarianism. They do not know the real condition of the European proletariat, whose revolutionary virtues they overestimate, and at the same time they distrust Yugoslavia to such a degree that a regime which is so admirable in so many ways appears in the eyes of those who believe the Chinese as a diabolical expression of predatory capitalism. Even admitting that they use Yugoslavia as an indirect method of attacking the USSR, their criticism cannot be shared by those who admire in Mao what was, in his day, the chief merit of Tito: the courage of his independence in the face of Moscow's absorbent power.

Rich Countries and Poor Countries

But, in spite of their errors and excesses, these "abominable sectarians" have put their finger on the sore, which is that the fundamental contradiction of our time resides in the struggle between the rich countries and the poor countries. The anger of the Chinese shows that this contradiction cuts across social regimes and appears as much in the communist as in the capitalist world. The statement of the tenth session of the eighth Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party is clear: "The imperialists, the reactionaries of different countries and the modern revisionists have undertaken all kinds of criminal activities to oppose Communism, the peoples, and the mass struggles of all the oppressed nations such as the Chinese People's Republic and all the other independent nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, which refuse to be slaves." From Mao's point of view, Cuba is one of the latter countries, and the USSR one of the former.

We must watch attentively all that happens in Cuba. It is a nearby and vibrant stage for the struggle between Peking and Moscow. "Chinese" blood circulates no doubt through her veins, but her stomach depends, for the time being, on Nikita Khrushchev.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COUPS IN IRAQ AND SYRIA

BY TABITHA PETRAN

The recent coups in Iraq and Syria realize the six-year-old Eisenhower Doctrine's goal of anti-Communist "Arab unity" under United States protection. The coups' authors are the international oil interests, the U.S., and their local placemen—the Baath and Arab Nationalist (Nasserist) parties, assorted militarists and feudals left over from Hashemite rule in Iraq, and in Syria elements from the right-wing Shaab party and the right and pro-American wing of the Moslem Brotherhood.

In the Iraq coup the smell of oil was overpowering. Iraq's December, 1961, taking away from IPC (Iraq Petroleum Company) and its associates of all unexploited concessions (99 percent of the original concession areas), its acquisition of a drilling rig from the USSR, and its decision to form a national oil company to exploit the seized areas were followed by a complete breakdown in the IPC-government negotiations, which had been stalled for nearly three years by IPC's rejection of every government demand and by an IPC slowdown in production which held royalties to the 1961 level. On February 3rd, Prime Minister Abdul Karim Kassim announced discovery of huge oil reserves, estimated at 3.5 billion tons, in the seized areas and his intention to establish the Iraq National Oil Company within the week. The company's dossier lay on his desk when the February 8th coup liquidated Kassim and his regime.

The coup leaders' first official statements assured IPC that its interests would be protected. They promised action on what London's *Financial Times* called IPC's "two principal aims"—recognition of Kuwait's independence and reduction of Basra export dues, raised by Kassim from one to ten cents a barrel—and "even indicated that the government may review the case

---

Tabitha Petran is an American journalist specializing in the Arab Middle East.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the seized concessions." (Beirut *Star,* February 14.) Oil interests in return promised a "technical miracle" to accelerate production and profits, putting at $60 million a year the increase in royalties the new government may expect from its "export program." (*Petroleum Intelligence Weekly,* cited by *Commerce du Levant,* March 3.)

In Syria, where large oil reserves have been discovered in the Jezira, the oil interest, if less blatant, is nonetheless real. Syria's desire to develop its own oil was the stumbling block in its protracted efforts to get Western aid to build the Euphrates Dam. Its virtual surrender—a tacit understanding the concession would go to the German-American Concordia Company in return for West Germany's construction of the Dam—was not enough. Oil imperialism can tolerate not a breath of democracy, and democracy was, against powerful outside pressures, slowly returning to Syria. In any event, the Syrian coup was required to support the Iraqi. Both coup governments are completely isolated from the people, an isolation reflected in their haste to conclude a Joint Command under which the armed forces of both may intervene against any external *or internal* threat in either state.

These governments represent a combination of old ruling elites with newer fascist groups. The petty bourgeois Arab Socialist Resurrection (Baath) Party, founded in Syria in 1945, originally drew its inspiration from the Nazi "philosopher" Alfred Rosenberg. Although it later claimed to have borrowed from, and improved on Marx, its concept of the "Arab nation" remains indistinguishable from Hitler's concept of the German; its socialism, an amalgam of demagogy and social reforms the petty bourgeois content of which is similar to that of classical fascism. Insignificant until the mid-1950's when it participated in the national fronts of that period and so won Communist and democratic support, its role was to split these fronts in Jordan, Syria, and Iraq; hence it is now widely regarded as an instrument of American imperialism. Since the union with Syria, the Baath is held in contempt in Syria: its leader Salah Betar, now Prime Minister, failed miserably in the December, 1961, elections as did most of his followers. The Arab Nationalist "parties" were established by the Egyptian Intelligence Service

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in 1955 and still have no clientele, acting simply as agents of the Nasser government. Differences between these two groups over the relation of their new regimes to Nasser's already exist since Baathists harbor resentments over the treatment Nasser accorded them during the union. More basic is the 4000-year-old conflict between Egypt and Iraq for control of Syria, a conflict which is now entering a new phase.

The savage Communist annihilation campaign in Iraq—for days Baghdad Radio exhorted listeners "to hunt out the Communists and kill them wherever they are"—is, as Interior Minister and Baath Party Secretary Sa'adi (already being called in Damascus the new Arab Hitler) admitted in his Cairo speech of February 22nd, a studied effort to get rid of "the enemies of Arab nationalism." How many have been murdered there is no way of ascertaining. Victims of teen-age "National Guard" squads include Communists and non-Communists, among them honored leaders of the long struggle against the Nuri Said regime. Three members of the CPI's Central Committee and many others have been executed.

The CPI's answer was to call on the people to fight back. The world press has maintained a conspiracy of silence about the stubborn Communist-led resistance to the Iraqi coup, which one conservative Beirut paper has called "the most serious struggle known in the Middle East and the Eastern Mediterranean since the end of the Second World War." Until the coup in Syria on March 8th, daily broadcasts were heard by Iran's Tudeh Party and, intermittently, the CPI's *Voice of Democratic Iraq,* rallying the people and reporting the course of this struggle: Baghdad's large Shia and working-class suburb, Khadimiya, held out against tank assaults for 18 days; 11 days after the coup, fighting was still going on in parts of Kirkuk province and in the Holy Shia cities of Nadjev and Kerbela, from which Iranian pilgrims were still barred; resistance in Basra, led by dockworkers, halted Iran's oil shipments through the Shatt Al Arab for three days and has flared several times since; a tank division which tried to join the resistance was forced back by air and ground forces; in Mosul three Communist attacks on February 27th killed many national guards, policemen, and soldiers. As of March 8th, Tudeh reported the Communists still

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

holding the entire southeast province of Amara bordering on Iran. Security measures imposed in Iraq testify to continuing guerrilla resistance. The CPI's radio is still broadcasting calls to battle.

The coup leaders may discover, as did Nuri Said, who launched seven Communist annihilation campaigns, that Communist annihilation in Iraq is self-defeating. For the CPI's roots go deep into the masses. Born out of the most militant working class in the Middle East, it began during the Second World War to do what no other party in this area has yet done: organize the peasants. A land of jacqueries and insurrections throughout its 5,000-year history, Iraq since the 1870's—when the Turks began to convert communal tribal into private lands, and especially during the interwar and postwar periods when massive peasant expropriations were carried out under the British land settlement laws—has experienced unprecedented peasant revolts against government, landlords, and tribal sheiks. The Communist task was not to create a revolutionary spirit but to direct it. The secret peasant associations the CPI began organizing in the remote province of Amara in 1944 were slowly extended after the war into the Lower and Middle Euphrates, Kurdistan, and Kut on the Tigris. Revolts in which these associations played a part helped to undermine the foundations of the Nuri Said regime; and within six weeks of the July, 1958, revolution 2,000 peasant associations held democratic elections and in some areas began to work the land cooperatively. If their level of development was uneven and not all were under Communist leadership, the CPI was their acknowledged spokesman, and when land reform officials went into the countryside in 1959 they were met by peasant assemblies chanting: "We are Yussef's countrymen. May Allah bless him." That was ten years after Yussef Salman Yussef, founder and leader of the CPI, was hanged in Baghdad.

Communists stood at the head of the workers' struggles for almost 30 years before the 1958 revolution and, soon after it, organized 70-80 percent of the working class. Communist workers formed the backbone of the People's Resistance Forces (PRF). Students, middle-class intellectuals, and professional people who came under CPI influence before as well as after

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the revolution, organized students, youth, women's, and professional associations. Disciplined in as savage a class war as can be found anywhere, the CPI saw three leaders of its Central Committee hanged in 1949 and successive central committees destroyed until it was left without leadership. Yet by 1952 it was leading a nation-wide insurrection against the West's Middle East Pact and in 1958 emerged as what the London *Economist* called "the largest and best organized political party in the Middle East."

Yet, as of now, imperialism and indigenous fascism have won. This reversal merits careful study in the light of the controversy over Marxist theory and strategy now dividing the socialist countries. The experiences of Iraq, where the CPI has been the strongest political force in the country, and of Syria, whose national bourgeoisie achieved between 1945 and 1957 a remarkable 19th-century-type expansion without a penny of foreign aid or foreign investment, test under very different conditions the relevancy of the new Soviet doctrine of "National Democracy." This doctrine, in contrast to Mao Tse-tung's "New Democracy," envisages decisive socialist and democratic advance while the capitalist structure of the state remains intact, and implicitly enjoins upon Communist parties non-revolutionary approaches. Space permits only a sketchy reference to some relevant factors in the development of the Iraq revolution, factors which raise a question to which no definitive answer can be given without an analysis of the Syrian and Iraqi Communist Parties.

The turning point in the Arab East may be placed on the morrow of the defeat of the Mosul revolt four years ago when the same elements, indigenous and foreign, now victorious in Iraq, attempted a similar coup. They were crushed then by the PRF and the mass organizations, by Kurdish peasants who came down from the hills to demolish their old enemies the Shammar sheiks (traditional hirelings of the imperialists, and the biggest feudal landlords in the North), and by a part of the Army. This popular victory gained in significance because of the government's paralysis before and during the revolt, preparations for which were made openly. Kassim resisted popular pressures to act before the revolt erupted and still hesitated even after it began since he knew a very large part

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Army's officer corps was involved, a fact not revealed at the time. Air Force Commander Awkatti, a leftist, bombed Mosul Citadel on his own responsibility when Kassim refused to act. Quick action by left and democratic officers blocked the participation of other Army divisions in the revolt.

Owing to the government's vacillation, the Mosul revolt turned into a clear class war: on one side feudal landlords, the northern landed and merchant bourgeoisie, reactionary army officers, Baathist and Arab Nationalist agents of the oil companies and of Nasser; on the other side workers, peasants, and soldiers led by the CPI. The masses won decisively; and in Mosul and other towns where government authority collapsed, popular committees representing the mass organizations took over the administration and began to deal out rough justice. The old ruling classes seemed to be ruined in northern Iraq and elsewhere to be in disarray. The Army was divided and demoralized. But democratic and left officers occupied a number of key Army posts, and the armed popular militia stood guard in almost every town and city. The CPI, now the real vanguard of the revolution, was the strongest organized force in the country. The mass organizations commanded almost a million members. Even if it is assumed that 50 percent of these were very loosely organized, half a million in a country of 6 million is a force to be reckoned with. The democratic movement was in triumphal advance: a month after Mosul the peasants' associations established a General Union, and in the next months their membership almost doubled. Many, if not most, of the million who paraded in Baghdad on May Day chanted the CPI slogan: *Communist participation in government.*

The government and the national bourgeoisie inevitably reacted negatively to these developments; Kassim was alarmed by the adoption of the CPI slogan among soldiers and even some officers. The CPI, instead of pushing forward when it had the initiative, suddenly drew back. It was no secret in Baghdad that the Soviet CP had been urging the CPI to pull back, while the Chinese CP is said to have given contrary advice. Whatever influenced the CPI decision, it must be considered on its merits. The CPI's reasoning is revealed in its auto-critique of July, 1959, which held its demand for a share

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in power to have been a mistake based on failure to understand correctly the role of the "national bourgeoisie" and the "national government" in the revolution, and failure to take account of the Arab and international situations.

The CPI's auto-critique raises more questions than it answers. Iraq's very weak national bourgeoisie had since the end of the Second World War played a role secondary to that of the CPI in the national movement, except in the Army. It was frightened now, not by CPI policies which defined the revolution as national, bourgeois, and democratic, but by the existence and rising power of the mass movement, especially the peasant movement, since all capitalists in Iraq are either owners of land, pumps, or agricultural machinery, or else trade in agricultural products. Iraq's land reform had been carefully drawn to serve the interests of these capitalists. The peasant movement, in transforming the outlook of the peasants, in teaching them to read and write, to work together and help each other in their associations, threatened the structure of controls in the countryside and could, if not halted, carry the reform beyond limits acceptable to these capitalists. The national bourgeoisie therefore began to join in feudalist attacks on the peasant movements, and to turn against its own land reform. This trend was accelerated by the fact that the reform did increase peasant consumption and hence reduced the landlord's share of the crop which went to the towns as surplus product. As a result, internal trade declined, a decline assisted by a deliberate landlord campaign to sabotage production. This reduction in the surplus affected the capitalists as landowners and merchants and also middle and small merchants, many of whom, unable to perceive their long term interest in the reform, began to turn against it.

The power of the organized masses, in short, made even bourgeois democratic aims unacceptable to the national bourgeois revolution. The CPI's withdrawal of its demand for a share in power left the state machine, its personnel virtually unchanged since Nuri Said's day, in the hands of a national bourgeoisie—for which destruction of the mass movement, especially the peasant movement, now had first priority—and of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kassim, whose overriding objective was to restore his control over the Army.

The CPI's assertion that it failed correctly to evaluate the Arab situation is difficult to understand. The decisive defeat of the large scale UAR intervention at Mosul surely militated against new interventions. This view, moreover, overlooks the fact that the Arab masses everywhere, especially in Egypt, then looked to Iraq and the CPI as the hope of the Arab world, and suggests a lack of faith in the masses uncharacteristic of the CPI.

Would the establishment of a Communist-led popular front, or even a Communist, government in Iraq have provoked world war? In this respect, 1959 seems no different from any other year. Which is the greater threat to world peace, advance of the anti-imperialist liberation movement or establishment of imperialist-fascist regimes in strategic sectors of the underdeveloped world?

Once the CPI sounded the retreat, it needed no crystal ball to foresee what followed. The rightists, eliminated as a political power by Mosul, no longer had organizations of their own. Kassim therefore put the full resources of the state at their disposal. The rightist comeback was not on a political basis but was achieved by the use of armed gangs which from individual assassinations passed to organized attacks, occupying first this remote village, then that; then this town and that; then this or that quarter of the larger towns and cities. Since the popular movement was too strong to permit frontal assault, the technique was to hit first at one point then another and to destroy the mass organizations in the provinces before tackling their headquarters in the cities. The success of the rightist comeback depended entirely on the Kassim-blessed cooperation it received from police, military, state, and local administrations. Not the armed attackers but the victims were arrested; if armed gangs could not destroy a union office, police obligingly closed it down, arrested and even killed its leaders.

Parallel to this undeclared civil war, Kassim dissolved the PRF, arrested the heroes of Mosul, effectively rid the Army of democratic elements, and brought back old-regime officers. The "Kirkuk massacres" of July, 1959, actually perpetrated by Baathist and oil company agents, as Kassim later admitted,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

became the Reichstag Fire of the Iraq counter-revolution—the pretext for arresting thousands of militants of the mass organizations, invalidating their democratic elections, and after protracted struggle placing their control in the hands of the Interior Ministry, or of employer, landlord, and Baathist agents. In Kassim's repression of the people's movement, Baathist, Arab Nationalists, old regimists, and the oil companies saw their opportunity; and within a few months of Mosul, as they now boast, began to plot the elimination of Kassim, once he had sufficiently weakened the Left to permit their own takeover.

Since Mosul, harsh repression has almost destroyed the mass organizations. Yet the CPI maintained active underground worker and peasant organizations: a vast peasant movement in 1961-1962 won peasant exemption from the land tax and some enforcement of the law on division of the crop. Even underground, the CPI remained the country's strongest political force. Hence Communist annihilation became the coup's first necessity. The CPI's struggle today, unfortunately, is being waged from infinitely worse positions than those it might have fought from in 1959 had civil war followed its insistence on a share in power. The peoples of Iraq, Syria, and of Egypt and all Arab countries have experienced a setback of no minor proportions. It is legitimate to ask whether the "new" approaches of the Soviet CP have not played a part in this setback.

Postscript, April 12:

Resistance is continuing and growing. The democratic forces hold areas in Kirkuk and Sulimaniya (both in Kurdestan), in Amara, in Najev and Basra provinces, and still occupy the town of Halabja. The tank division which tried to join the resistance was crushed by the Air Force, as reported earlier, and 51 officers arrested. That took place on February 27. Between then and mid-March, 200 Army officers fled to the resistance areas and have joined the popular army. Colonel Taher Bamirly, former Commander of the Popular Resistance Forces, is now commanding all the resistance forces. Khadimiya, the suburb of Baghdad, which I reported as falling, was in fact evacuated in good order because it seemed an unnecessarily exposed position for what could be accomplished from there.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN RADICALISM: FURTHER DISCUSSION

BY JAMES WEINSTEIN

In the February issue of MR, we published an article entitled "American Radicalism: Liberal or Socialist?" by Ronald Radosh. This was followed by discussion in the March and April issues. This month we publish further comments on the same subject. The first is by James Weinstein, one of the editors of *Studies on the Left*.—The Editors

Robert Forrey's "Reply to Mr. Radosh" raises issues requiring clarification and rescue from the Communist mythology of the American radical past. Forrey's failure to understand Radosh's purpose flows from an enchantment with tactics: from an inability to separate essentially tactical questions from those that are ideological or political. The issue is not, as Forrey asserts, whether "real radicals should work for nothing short of immediate revolution." Except for the Communist party in its first two years (1919-1921), no serious radical movement in the United States ever advocated such a program. Nor is the point whether or not radicals should support Medicare—although it does seem that a genuine radical might have something more advanced to offer on this score even if he is ready to accept Medicare in the end. The real issue is whether the Communist or any other party has developed and presented an independent radical perspective on the needs and possibilities of American society, which is neither borrowed from foreign experiences rooted in historical situations entirely different from our own nor adopted from the dominant liberalism of America's policy-making corporation leadership.

Forrey's inability to understand the issue involved is not his alone, as his extensive quotation of William Z. Foster proves. Thus, Foster begins with the platitude that democratic struggles strengthen socialism and weaken world capitalism. This may or may not be true, depending on what it means, but it is so vague as to have no relation to the problem at hand. If, for example, the 1930's were a period in which the Left did substantially contribute to the democratic movements of the New Deal, as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Forrey claims, then according to Foster's formula the end of the decade should have witnessed a greatly strengthened socialist movement in the U.S. and a substantial weakening of American capitalism. By 1940, however, American capitalism was better off than it was in 1930, and any objective observer would conclude that the socialist movement had failed to take advantage of its opportunities and had not grown in a manner even remotely commensurate with them. Of course it might be argued that what happened, and what failed to happen, in the 1930's was the result of "other factors"; but this does little to enhance the value of Foster's tautology. To draw this conclusion proves only that one should not rely on platitudes as tools of analysis.

Foster's argument continues by repetition until he asserts that even under "reformist leadership" which "specifically endorse[s] capitalism" democratic reforms undermine the system. As proof, Foster offers only the observation that all such movements have "had to overcome bitter capitalist opposition."

Unfortunately, history, and certainly American history, does not bear out Foster's clincher. In Germany, for example, Bismarck instituted an entire system of social reforms that succeeded in weakening the socialist movement and in greatly strengthening the capitalist system there. In the U.S. during the First World War, the Wilson administration recognized the right of pro-war unions to organize, so that under the United States Railroad Administration membership in the railroad brotherhoods jumped from 220,000 to 1,400,000 in two years. Thus Wilson won the support of the AFL, greatly strengthened his ability to conduct the war, and further isolated the Socialists from the labor movement. This met with no serious opposition from the capitalists. Similarly today, in return for support of the Cold War and official anti-Communism, the AFL-CIO is generally accepted and even protected by the administration with full support from the dominant sections of our corporation leadership. Even in the 1930's, when the Communists were so active in helping to organize the CIO, it was not the largest corporations which were most bitter in their opposition. In auto, it was Ford, not General Motors, which offered the greatest resistance to the organizing drives, just as in steel it was "Little

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Steel," not "Big Steel," against which the really bitter battles were fought.

In the late 19th century, in Germany, the "revisionist" Eduard Bernstein, like Foster, proposed a series of democratic reforms that would gradually undermine capitalism, strengthen the socialist movement, and result in the slow and peaceful passage to socialism. Similarly, the so-called right-wing American Socialists in 1919 proposed support for reform. William M. Brandt and G. A. Hoehn, of St. Louis, advocated a "solidified Socialist Party movement" that would be "in constant contact with the organized labor movement," and whose members would "participate in the daily battles and struggles" of the workers. Socialists, Brandt and Hoehn wrote, must at all times "endeavor to advance the unity, integrity, and solidarity of the proletarian movement"; for only "by cooperation and aid, coupled with consistent educational efforts," would the Party be able to "strengthen and solidify the movement for socialism." (*St. Louis Labor,* August 23, 1919.)

On the surface it appears that there is essential agreement between Foster on the one hand, and Bernstein and Brandt and Hoehn on the other. But Bernstein and the Americans stressed the need for socialists to lead the movements for reform, and the Americans put special emphasis on the need for socialist education in order to create the mass consciousness that is a prerequisite for changing society to conform to the will of the working classes. Foster fails to mention these tasks, and Forrey neglects to add them himself. Indeed, Foster explicitly states that even those movements of reform led by supporters of capitalism automatically move society in the direction of socialism—and thereby he relegates consciousness to the dustbin and elevates the blind forces of history to undisputed ruler. According to Foster and Forrey, the forces leading toward socialism have nothing to do with man's will to shape his own future. If this is so there is no need to be concerned with radical politics.

Some may argue that there is another difference between Foster and Bernstein: Foster's stated position is not really what he means; his theory, like everything else, is only a tactic. With respect to Foster, this does not seem to be true, since he took the same (syndicalist) position in his book on the Steel Strike

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(1920). With Forrey, however, this may well be so. But that means simply that he has no theory, that his understanding of the nature of American society is limited to a collection of clichés and generalizations that pass for Marxism among the dogmatists. In practice, like the entire organized Left, Forrey can only respond to moves made by the liberal Establishment. He is the prisoner of its over-view, not a participant in the creation of an independent radical approach.

Looked at this way, the end of ideology proclaimed by Daniel Bell is as characteristic of the Communists as it is of the liberals. The liberal Establishment is devoid of a vision of the future other than a perpetuation of the status quo. But despite their assertions to the contrary, the Communists also have no meaningful conception of a better society. If they have any such view it is based on Soviet experience, one that uses Russia as a blueprint. There is nothing wrong with this *per se,* except that the nature of present Russian society (which is as far as most American radicals can see and further than some) is no more attractive to alienated Americans of all classes than is the liberal status quo. Indeed, even for socialists in such countries as Poland, Cuba, and Yugoslavia, Soviet social existence provides no model to emulate. The relationship of these countries with the Russians is based on the Soviet role in world politics, not on the style of life in Russia. The revolutionary regimes in these countries have been able to inspire mass popular followings in so far as they have developed visions of the future consistent with their own traditions and national aspirations. The American Communists have never done this, and today cannot even understand language directed to this end.

As for Forrey's perception of the editorial in *Studies on the Left* (Volume III, Number 1), charity forces one to assume that he read it hastily. The psychology of the "worse the better" is real on the Left, but was introduced into American politics by the Communists at the time of the formation of their party in 1919. At that time, the Communists violently attacked anyone who dared advocate reform. Their Manifesto, adopted at Chicago in 1919, declared that Communist "parliamentary representatives" must "not introduce or support reform measures," but were to "analyze" such proposals "as evasions of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the issue and as of no fundamental importance to the working class." In conformity with the position that the "uncompromising character of the class struggle must be maintained under all circumstances," the party forbade cooperation with the Socialist Party, the Labor Party, the Nonpartisan League, or any such group. The theory underlying this was that the system was about to collapse, as it had in Russia, and that then the Communists would seize power.

This has nothing in common with the position of *Studies on the Left* or that of Radosh. Neither advocates support of the ultra-Right. The point simply is that the domestic program of the Right could only lead to the break-up of the consensus of corporation liberals, the official trade union movement, farm organizations, and others, without which a continuation of the Cold War would be politically impossible—and that therefore the dominant corporate interests in this country have not supported the ultra-Right, and probably will not. Since these groups have little independent strength (witness the defeat of the Birchite Congressmen in the recent election), this means the ultra-Right is a minor threat. As to the danger of their warlike proclivities, the point is that the liberals, as architects of the Cold War, are themselves capable of moving swiftly to war when (if) they become convinced there is no viable alternative.

The more support the Left gives to the Cold War moderates (Stevenson, Bowles, etc.) the more leverage is given to those who attack from the Right. Purely from a tactical point of view, if one desires to strengthen the moderates it is necessary to build a strong opposition to Cold War liberalism from the Left. There is no contradiction, in this case, between taking a principled position and being tactically shrewd.

Forrey writes that "Dimitroff's theories about a united front are not invalid in America simply because Dimitroff was European." He is correct: this is not the reason. First, it is an open question whether or not Dimitroff's theories made sense even in Europe in the 1930's. Clearly a united front of workers (Communist and Social Democratic) with liberal bourgeois elements in Germany might have prevented fascism there. But German Communists *at that time* proposed no such policy, believing instead that after the fascists gained power they would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be next (the genuine "the worse the better" psychology). *After* the Nazis gained power, Dimitroff enunciated his theories and they were applied throughout Europe by the Communists, without much success. Second, in this country these theories always were irrelevant. There never was a threat of fascism in this country. Indeed, to view fascism as "an international phenomenon," as Forrey and the Communists do, is only to confuse matters.

In its classic form in Germany, fascism had four essential characteristics: abandonment of parliamentary democracy, following a crisis in the system which threatened the German ruling class with loss of power; commitment to a policy of aggressive war to stabilize the economy and regain the empire taken away at Versailles; a corporate organization of society in which various interest groups were represented extra-politically; a racist nationalism to excite support for the program of war and conquest. In the United States there is no threat from the Left even remotely resembling that in Germany, and so no prospect of a crisis in the two-party system. The ultra-Right does not call for limitations on existing political democracy. Indeed, it is the Kennedy administration that talks of the need to take problems "out of politics," to make them administrative; and the ultra-Right objects most vociferously. As for the concept of a corporate society—inclusion of trade unions, farm organizations, NAACP, ACLU, etc., in the consensus—it is the liberals who favor this, while the ultra-Right would destroy such alliances and force labor back into the arena of politics to play an independent role (at least the ultras say they would do this.) On the question of racism, it is true, some ultras are worse than most liberals.

Even on the question of war, the difference between the liberals and the ultra-Right is not great. True, the ultras are essentially irrational on this question, but their commitment to win the Cold War is no greater than that of the liberals. If the ultra-Right were in power it would probably function in much the same manner as does Kennedy, who, relieved of responsibility, could call for war with Cuba—as he did during his Presidential campaign. (Nixon then said "no".)

The point of this is not that liberals are the true fascists,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but that the concept of fascism in relation to the United States is worse than useless. It might seem a great tactic to plaster the ultra-Right with the label of fascism—after all, Americans are anti-fascist—but when the result is self-deception in respect to the real relation of forces in the country, tactics should be abandoned and non-mythological analysis substituted.

The Communists have been confused on this question more than once before. In 1924 they attacked the La Follette movement as proto-fascist, though they later repudiated this view. Similarly, in the early 1930's they attacked Roosevelt and the New Deal as fascist; but after the Third International adopted the united front tactic, they embraced Roosevelt as an ally in the common fight. In the interim nothing significant had changed on the American political scene. The new tactic was adopted only in response to Russia's espousal of the policy. Thus, in 1934 the Communists attacked Norman Thomas for appearing on the same platform with Eleanor Roosevelt, and in 1936 condemned him for failure to support FDR for re-election. There were, of course, different forces at work in the New Deal coalition in these years, but the diversity was no greater than that of the Theodore Roosevelt-Woodrow Wilson progressive era. In 1936 the only movement that could even remotely be characterized as fascist was the Union Party, and that was made up as much of radicals who refused to follow the Communists into the liberal-corporation consensus as it was of reactionaries. Of course, the Union Party never remotely threatened the stability of the two-party system.

Dimitroff's united front was not a united front for securing reforms, but one designed to prevent fascism and war. Neither threat existed in the United States in the 1930's, but the Communists instituted the policy because they did not understand that their first duty as radicals was to help build a mass movement for socialism in the United States, rather than to act as the tactical arm of Soviet national policy. Thus, when pressed, a Communist might admit the absence of a fascist danger at home, but justify the united front with the New Deal as necessary to defend socialism in the Soviet Union—as part of an international united front against the Nazis. But even if such a policy had got results in the short run—which it did not—in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the long run it did much to weaken the radical movement in this country. Since this country is now the major source of world reaction, the policy also weakened the world movement for socialism in the long run.

In answer to Forrey's final point about anti-Communism on the Left, it must be observed that Communists cannot forever hide behind anti-anti-Communism to gain immunity from criticism. Unfortunately, Forrey chose indefensible ground on which to defend the Communist party against the McCarran Act. Radosh is correct: the Communists did separate themselves from Roosevelt and the New Deal—or at least from the left-wing New Dealers—only in their ideological and political ties to the Soviet Union. There is nothing criminal in this, but it does disqualify them from any claim to leadership of American radicalism.

There was a time when Communists themselves did not hesitate to express their dependence upon the Russians. In 1923, for example, when, as now, many splinter groups existed outside the party, H. M. Wicks wrote (*The Worker,* March 31, 1923) that once the dissidents understood the Party's "relation to the Communist International," they would accept the Communist program as one that "no Marxist can possibly criticize one line of it." Communists had this confidence in their program because it was "in complete harmony with the principles of the Red Trade Union International." Radicals were advised to fall in line not because Communists possessed superior ability to analyze American conditions, but because theirs was "the recognized party." Failure to join would force the unfortunate radical to "remain outside the world movement." Today, as in 1923, the Communist party's major appeal is its status as the "recognized" party. But fortunately for the unaffiliated radical it is now clear that the Russian way to socialism is not the only way, however well suited it may have been in its own historical context. Serious American radicals must work out their own solution.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BY DOMINIC MASCIO

Mr. Forrey in answering the article by Ronald Radosh runs away with himself. As I understood Radosh, he was not saying that Roosevelt or Bowles or other liberals were evil in any sense of the word. What he was saying was that people who call themselves socialists or Communists or any other variation of left winger, should endeavor to give the people they reach a better answer for the ills of capitalism, not just more liberalism. He sums up this viewpoint very well in his last paragraph. And his last sentence reads: *"Leaving liberalism to the liberals,* America might yet gain an independent and growing socialist Left."

It seems to me that the discussion between Radosh and Forrey is germane to the more basic question involved in the "Russian" approach vs. the "Chinese." Forrey's answer was largely based on fear. Fear of the right wingers; fear of the bomb. We must consider everything we do, and each position we take, in fear of the Pandora's Box which will open up and swallow us all, if we go too far too fast.

How much of this is due, not to fear of what will happen to the millions of destitute and starving people in this world but to fear for our own lives and the lives of those close to us? This fear is natural, but it does not answer the problem of millions of desperate people who need revolution, so that they may ***begin*** to live.

This is like the white people, North and South, who say, "We favor improvement in the lot of the Negro, but it must be done slowly." It is easy to say this sort of thing when you are living in relative comfort, when the heel is not on *your* neck, when it is not *your* children who die when they need not die.

First, what is it that we socialists and left wingers want for this world? We want a better material life for *all* the people. We want dignity and equality *for every single person* on this earth. Liberals seem to settle if they can get these things for just a majority of the people. And they sometimes settle for much less. What makes a left winger is that he will not settle for less, and he wants it now!

The Russians, and the European Communists too, seem to be saying: "Let's take it easy. We want socialism for everyone,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but not too fast." The Russian people have suffered extreme hardships. Now that they have achieved considerable material progress and a measure of socialist living, we in America certainly cannot criticize them if they choose to risk less and to enjoy some of the fruits of their struggles.

Having said all this, and having granted the right of the liberal to his viewpoint, the right of the tired radical to his, and certainly the right of the Russian Communists to theirs, what is the discussion all about? It is simply this. Those people or groups who must consider their own comforts and their own safety in defining the needs of the poor of this world, forfeit their claim to leadership. They may still be humane people, but they are not the leaders of the revolution.

The Chinese Communists seem to be saying: "We must strike for the people's revolution wherever the opportunity presents itself. We will not take foolish risks, but we will risk much after coming to a thoughtful decision. The giant is strong, but his feet are of clay. However, he can stand on those clay feet for an eternity unless we chip away and undermine him. All this must be done as fast as possible. For those feet of clay may spread their base. Then the evil giant will never topple."

The strength of the capitalist system lies in its ability to widen its base in the middle class. Given time and the pressure of labor unions, liberals, *et al,* this expansion does take place. If the expansion went far enough eventually to include everyone, there might be no need for a more radical solution (excluding the question of the kind of civilization that this development produces). But this expansion of a better *material* life for greater numbers reaches a point where the pressures for further improvement are balanced by the very size of the middle class. The leaders who arise from the poor people are frustrated by the long struggle and meager results. Having somewhat greater ability than their brothers, they find for themselves a place in the middle class. Capitalist society does not consist of capitalists and workers. It consists of rich and poor. Or more exactly, it consists of very rich, rich (middle class), poor, and very poor. (In economic colonies, as in South America, the middle class can be very small. The oligarchy depends more on the backing of the United States.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is in this sense that reformists and liberals (and left wingers who help them—I include myself in this category) play into the hands of the elite. It may be that in some situations there is no real choice. It is reform or nothing, as in the U.S. However, wherever the situation is ripe, we must avoid reform and attempt revolution. It is a choice between a partial and really empty victory or a complete transformation of society.

BY ABRAHAM UNGER

Mr. Radosh's piece says and proves what has long been the fact, that the socialist movement in the United States has ceased to be radical and has dissolved into liberalism. This criticism has been made by bourgeois intellectuals and pooh-poohed as enemy propaganda; it has been made within the precincts of the Left itself, but in whispers. A radical, Mr. Radosh, has said it out loud, and high time.

It is clear that Radosh uses the terms liberal and radical not sociologically to designate those who are for and those who are against reform—obviously nobody, let alone liberals and radicals, is against reforms and the struggle for them—but as political terms to distinguish those, the liberals, who believe or act as if capitalism can be reformed so as to eliminate the evils of poverty, exploitation, discrimination, and war, from those, the radicals, who believe that to accomplish this, capitalism must be uprooted and replaced by a socialist system. It has been generally accepted that the old Socialist Party which in the past was a radical party is today fairly designated liberal. It is the contention of Radosh that today the term must also be applied to the Communist Party.

His central point is that the radicals have arrived at this position because they made a dichotomy between the government's domestic and its foreign policy. It is political schizophrenia to act as if the two were not interrelated, as if the administration was being naturally progressive on the home front while its backward foreign policy was being forced upon it. This amounts to the elevation of reforms above political action for socialism, until at last reforms become the sum total of political action and socialism becomes the peroration of speeches and resolutions.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This has been true under Republican and Democratic regimes, from New Deal to New Frontier, under Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. The change may be traced as far back as Roosevelt's second term, when New Deal reforms became the excuse for sidetracking socialist political action. The dissolution of the Communist Party in 1944 was a logical culmination, but unfortunately its reconstitution as a political party did not bring a change of policy. The radical movement did not revert to its old line of socialist political action but contented itself with verbal criticism of the government's foreign policy while concentrating on domestic reforms. Somehow the radicals always found themselves debating which of monopoly's candidates not to oppose, never how to bring a socialist program to the people.

Clearly this makes the radical indistinguishable from the liberal, the socialist from the capitalist, and no amount of verbal agility can succeed in deceiving thinking radicals any longer. Nor is the working class deceived: America's 65 million workers want peace and disarmament no less than jobs and security, but they pay no attention to what the radical movement has to say, for the good and sufficient reason that it has nothing to offer them different from what the liberals hold out.

The consequence of the abandonment of a socialist policy of political action has been, as everyone knows, the disappearance of the radical movement in the U.S. Radicals remain, in large numbers, but an organized movement is no more. There is no doubt that its enemies have attacked it fiercely, but they could not have destroyed the radical movement had radicals not allowed it to be liquidated by permitting its socialist content to be drained away.

This leads to another important point made by Mr. Radosh, albeit implicitly, that the only answer to the problems confronting the American nation, the only solution radicals have to offer, is socialism. What is decisive at this moment is the public and popular advocacy of socialism in the United States. That can be undertaken only by radicals who believe not only that the capitalist system should be uprooted and replaced with a socialist one but that socialism is the only answer, that all capacity for reform must be placed in that context, that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

socialism is the present not the future task of the working people, that it is not contingent on the prior acquisition of reforms but upon a wholly different factor, the organization of all radicals into a movement that will establish an open, mass, political party of socialism. Radosh foresees rough going and his pessimism is understandable. Here we are, radicals in a highly industrialized country, fertile and rich in natural resources, blessed with a vast body of intelligent and experienced manual and mental workers, capable of producing everything that every one of the 180 million of us needs for a secure and happy life, in short, rotten-ripe for socialism! Yet, here we are, after 75 years of radicalism in our country, with no organized political movement for or advocacy of socialism. It is the great sin of the radical movement that while calling itself Communist, it has failed, wilfully, not by oversight, to bring these truths to the working class whose vanguard it purports to be. Instead, it has encouraged the belief that the capitalist class and its government would adopt a full-blown policy of social reform at home *and* of non-intervention abroad—if only there were no ultra-Right, or the labor movement would curb Meany. This is socialism learned, not from Marx and Engels, but from Joy Adamson and Elsa the Lioness. There is really only one answer: the United States needs a socialist movement; it can only be political; it must expose all aspects of government policy; and every honest radical has the duty to organize it now.

In conclusion may I say: *Illegitimi non carborundum,* which means "Don't let the bastards grind you down, Mr. Radosh." Don't get trapped by quotations from the ancients, living or dead. Remember what Marx said about "Marxists." Just stick to the truth as you understand it, for the truth is mighty and shall prevail.

P.S. Doesn't an editor have an obligation to his contributors to protect them from being hit below the belt? I think it is intellectual obscenity to accuse a writer of red-baiting (as Forrey does) or of being a McCarranite because he criticizes the Communist Party's words and actions adversely. If that attitude is tolerated, it means that the Communist Party must remain immune from criticism—an attitude, by the way, which leads to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the most awful malady members of a radical movement can suffer, puppetism.

BY MILT BLOCH

The debate between Ronald Radosh and Robert Forrey is especially welcome to one like myself who looks toward the birth of an organized new Left as the beginning of a Marxist presence in American life. It is significant that MONTHLY REVIEW initiates the debate. For it, together with *National Guardian, Studies on the Left,* and a few other periodicals, seems to be the bearer of the seed from which will surely sprout an ideologically cohesive, effective Marxist movement. Such a movement is sorely needed to give direction, meaning, and purpose to our lives as socialists and to prepare and educate the cadres for the great social struggles of tomorrow.

Mr. Radosh is on the right track. But in oversimplifying his point he left himself open to the kind of anti-De Leonist attack launched by Mr. Forrey. It was so easy. "An analysis which takes account of all existing contradictions and tendencies within that class is lacking in Mr. Radosh's article." True, Mr. Radosh doesn't distinguish between Goldwater's "war now" policy and Chester Bowles' policy of negotiations. But the decisions in American foreign policy are not being made today by Goldwater or Bowles. The decisive factor is, after all, Kennedy and that main sector of American capitalist influence that he represents. The other two point to the general indecisiveness of United States capitalism faced by the impossible contradictions of the day. The real question today is: what should be a socialist's attitude toward Kennedy? If we had a left movement of some influence in the mass we might decide to pressure Bowles and others to assert themselves as part of our fight for peaceful coexistence. But *if we had* is not the same as having. *If we had,* all things in America and the world would be different and we could all be more optimistic. At the same time, the Left should not kid itself or anyone else about the significance of rifts in the American ruling class. On any question affecting the life or death of the social system, rifts are not to be expected. A prime lesson

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Cuban blockade crisis was the terrible unity with which the administration faced the possible holocaust. Those who doubted kept their mouths shut.

Well, then, what about Kennedy? The main illusion among the workers, intellectuals *et al* of our country is that welfare-state capitalism, as it has been developed in the United States, is the sure path to a better life for all and that it should be defended to the death, if necessary, against its main enemy—Communism. Now the real and terrible truth about the world today, as I assume we all agree, is that open democratic America has evolved in the past two decades into a society harboring the deadliest form of cancer man has ever faced. In its usual anarchic development it has created the most deadly anti-humanist nuclear-war productivity that is now an essential feature of its being, providing the only stimulus for growth and profit. Welfare-state reforms have in the recent period served not to forge greater consciousness among the mass in their own power and destiny, but rather to corrupt and bourgeoisify workers and intellectuals and tie them in mind and body to the war machine. The Commander-in-Chief of this death-dealing alliance of all classes is John F. Kennedy.

Our first task, then, is to expose the society we live in not only in broad general terms but on specific issues such as disarmament, nuclear testing, Alliance for Progress, and so on.

Second, we must be clear about Kennedy. Who he is, what he does, can be understood mainly in relation to the warfare state he represents. It needs to be said that if Nixon had gotten the few votes he missed, we would be no nearer or further from war or peace. The real social pressures would be about equal on both, given the present relatively quiescent class struggle. War or peace today and the actions leading to one or the other involve life or death for our entire social structure. The President, whoever he might be today, would be keenly aware of this fact and act accordingly. Ike at Camp David, Kennedy holding off on the invasion of Cuba, act each in relation to this truth. It seems to me that our role, the job of American Marxists, is clear. Our job is not to pressure Kennedy but to expose him and his society in book and pamphlet, from lecture platforms, in agitational speeches where the few opportunities present themselves.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Expose and condemn, expose and condemn—this is a role Marxists can fulfill today and it is one that the times call for.

Mr. Forrey's main errors flow from an incorrect view of the working class or mass as it really exists in the United States today and along with this an unreal attitude toward the few conscious socialist elements in its midst. The task of Marxists is not to repeat platitudes about "masses" learning through daily experience of the necessity for social change. We are not, after all, talking about an historical mass. We are talking about a specific American working class in a specific historical period. What has Mr. Forrey to tell us about this class and these times? Nothing really. He repeats broad general historic generalities that contribute little to answering the always decisive question of what is to be done now.

Engels had no such illusions when at a certain period in British working-class history he angrily condemned the class as corrupted and bourgeoisified. That was a correct description, and Engels was materialist enough to know that the same class would, in different circumstances, be prepared to storm the barricades. So it is today. The mass, mass pressure, mass influence are closed doors to serious Marxists and one will get punch-drunk banging one's head against stone doors. We meet such groggy warriors every day in our Left. Mr. Forrey calls it leadership to egg these frustrated souls on. No. It is clear that the present task of socialists is to educate and organize the few wonderful cadres that have preserved their sanity and devotion to socialism in the slimy conditions of American life, and to prepare them for the job ahead. That job is to establish links with the working class and participate in its inevitable radicalization.

MR PRESS

REMINDER

You have only until May 30 to order

THREE TACTICS: THE BACKGROUND IN MARX

by Stanley Moore

at the prepub price of $1.50 (list price $2.25)

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

The Lower Depths in Chile

I have been spending some time in South America with a view to understanding the political, economic, and social needs of that part of the world. When one of my friends in Santiago, the capital of Chile, asked if I would like to see some of the desperately poor "mushroom" settlements that are springing up on the outskirts of the city I was glad to go along.

We climbed into his four-wheel-drive jeep. Once out of the city center I understood the reason for a jeep. The mushroom town we had entered had no street pavements and no sidewalks. Hundreds of tiny huts were packed tightly, side by side, in long rows with little space along which vehicles or people could move. In places big holes had been dug for future sewage pipes in the passageways between the houses. Scores of children played in and around these ditches. Some of the holes were puddled knee-deep with mud. Even a jeep could not negotiate such spots.

The wind lifted clouds of dust from the unpaved land and deposited it thickly on everything. What was not muddy was dusty or dirty. All around, as far as the eye could see, were rows upon rows of shacks. Some had been built by the occupants; some had been constructed by a government-chartered home-building corporation. Occasionally a building rose to two or even three stories; most were one-storied, opening directly on the street, with no land around. There were few shrubs or bushes and no trees anywhere in sight across the flat sun-baked, dust-covered landscape. Pathetic attempts had been made here and there to grow vines or flowers along house walls. One word could describe the scene: desolation.

From this mushroom village, less than ten years old, we drove to another fairly recent settlement nearby, which was built up along both sides of a railroad track. There, hovels huddled up to the rails as if seeking escape from the drab uniformity

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all around them. This second "town" differed little from the first. There were the same endless rows of huts, the same unpaved thoroughfares, the same absence of vegetation, the same dusty dreariness.

Our next stop was in an old part of the city. There, beyond the big public market, we entered a mushroom town that had stood for at least twenty years in and around a city dump. If the newer mushroom villages were desolate, this old one was sinister. Here roofs and shelters were made with materials picked up on the dump: wooden and cardboard boxes, metal roofing, old boards and building paper. The lean-to sheds were scattered haphazardly here and there, with no pretence of straight rows or paths. Instead of streets there were dank alleys, with only dust, mud, and refuse between the ramshackle shanties.

All over the world—from Tokyo, to Delhi, to Athens, to Santiago—I have seen such shanty towns. But how and why did so many Chileans find their way into these horrible habitations, I asked. The answer was simple. Chile is a large, mountainous, sparsely inhabited, and dry country. Farming without irrigation is difficult and hazardous. Irrigation costs money. To succeed on the land an individual farmer needs both water and some machinery. Big estates own the best farm land. Foreign mining companies have extensive land concessions: 52.9 percent of the arable land and 72.6 percent of all farm land is owned by 4.1 percent of the population. Farm labor is hired for only part of the year, with wages starting at 1,000 pesos a day—or 40 cents in U.S. money. In the off-season the jobless farm hands drift into the cities hoping to find odd jobs.

Cities draw people as magnets draw iron-filings. Movement, activity, bright lights, close neighbors, and the quest for riches are the lure. Families pour in and overflow to the edges of the slums. Able bodied men hope at least to earn a pittance shining shoes. Women and children can beg. So the drift to the cities goes on and the shacks mushroom.

A few days before we took our jeep ride around Santiago, I had gone by bus a hundred miles over the mountains to Valparaiso, the largest seaport on the west coast of South America and Chile's second largest city. Along the low hilltops overlooking the Pacific I walked miles through housing as bad or worse

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than anything I saw in Santiago, although these shanty-dwellers had better air by the sea and could dispose of their messy refuse by dumping it over and down the steep cliffs.

Perhaps I should note in passing that Santiago and Valparaiso are thriving centers of commerce and industry. Santiago is an especially fine and, in many ways, a beautiful city. In the center of town the streets are clean; parks are inviting; there are many beautiful homes. The business district is made up of large office, bank, and public buildings, department stores, small shops, and luxury hotels. But all of these real-estate talking points only make the contrast with the shack towns more unbearable.

I looked for some printed information which would give a little perspective on this lopsided situation. I came across two recent reports that impressed me. One was made by the Peoples Action Front (FRAP), to be used in the presidential campaign which was getting started while I was there. The other, under the title *El Deber Social y Politico en la Hora Presente,* was issued in 1962 by the Roman Catholic Bishops of Chile. The two reports are in substantial agreement on many of the facts concerning Chile. I will quote only from the report of the Bishops, although I would like to give both reports in full.

> All the countries of Latin America are passing through a period of great difficulties which affect especially the economic, political and social order. . . . It is very easy for a population concentrated in cities to ignore what goes on in the country, but a considerable part of our people live there oppressed by poverty and in distressful conditions. . . . The situation of a great number of families lacking decent housing, stacked in poor sections of our cities, is no better. . . . It may be seen in the miles and miles of poverty surrounding the modern urban centers. It is impossible to demand that these displaced workers defend and promote a society which has made them marginal. . . . A tenth part of the Chilean population receives around one half of the national income, while the other nine-tenths must subsist on the other half. This deplorable situation, continued over a long period, is driving Chileans thus humiliated into a condition of silent but growing bitterness and disillusionment. . . . This maldistribution of Chilean wealth appears in the undernourishment of the people. . . . Poverty, ignorance, and desperation are before the eyes of all. The general solutions which will meet the situation must be based on a justice which all can understand and accept.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I was impressed by the sweep and the fervor of the condemnation which the Bishops directed against the human inadequacies of the Chilean economy and society. Chile began its fight for independence 150 years ago, in 1810. For five generations it has been part of the Latin American "free world" which President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress is designed to perpetuate. Chileans have had ample opportunity to test out the competitive, acquisitive, exploitive society which is called Western Civilization. The devastation of human values and human life described in the report of the Bishops (and underlined and amplified by the platform of the Peoples Action Front) is not a special case. Similar conditions may be found in one country after another on one continent after another. They are the typical results which have followed from the impact of capitalist imperialism on the underdeveloped countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

I fail to understand how any person of intelligence and good will can see or even read of the ghastly failures of a competitive free-enterprise society without realizing that neither the United States nor any of the other capitalist powers has an answer that will satisfy the Chilean people or the people who live in any other part of the underdeveloped world.

Defense and Offense

Secretary of State Dean Rusk is quoted as telling a press conference on February 1, 1963, that the Soviet Union has anti-aircraft installations, tanks, and artillery units in Cuba manned by Soviet personnel. Said the Secretary: "The continued presence of Soviet military personnel in Cuba is something that should preoccupy the entire Hemisphere."

President Kennedy, in a recent address to the nation, said that the United States was maintaining three divisions of armed men in South Korea. Presumably they are equipped with anti-aircraft installations, tanks, and artillery. To draw a parallel, the continued presence of United States military personnel in South Korea is something that should preoccupy the entire continent of Asia.

The State Department defines arms in Cuba as offensive, whereas arms in South Korea are defensive. This opens up the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole question of defense and aggression. Someone has pointed out that a gun in my pocket is defensive, whereas a gun in your pocket is offensive. It seems to depend on who has the gun.

Cuban statesmen remind the world of the April 1961 invasion of Cuba, of hit-and-run raids along the Cuban coast, of the reports from Guatemala, Nicaragua, Mexico, and Washington that preparations are being made for a second invasion. "For these reasons," the Cubans say, "we are preparing to defend ourselves against invaders and raiders. There is no evidence showing an intention on our part to invade the United States. The arms against which Secretary Rusk protests are for defense, not offense."

Perhaps the Secretary would retort that the present Cuban socialist way of life is repulsive to the American people, and the Cubans might reply that the present United States capitalist way of life is repulsive to the Cuban people. So the argument goes, back and forth.

Meanwhile, all over the world, people want to go on living. Increasingly they are coming to believe that the new weapons are making life less and less secure. The argument about defensive and offensive weapons may continue, but each day it is becoming more and more evident that if mankind is to survive, the arms race must stop and be replaced by speedy disarmament and world-wide coexistence and cooperation.

The Last Leaf

In his first 1963 news conference, Dean Rusk told his listeners that the chaotic disarray in the Western Alliance caused by the bull-headed intervention of President de Gaulle in the debate over Common Market membership for Great Britain would not dissuade the West from pursuing its great purpose of containing Communism.

Carrying out this great purpose, United States strategists under Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy have spent eighteen years and tens of billions of dollars on the major job of encircling, containing, and constricting Communism. In its early stages the containment policy was built around the restored economic and political stability of Great Britain and France as the backbone of the Atlantic Alliance. When both of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these nations failed to develop the necessary economic and political strength, Franco's Spain was called upon for collateral support. As a final resort, Washington turned to West Germany, with its re-dynamized economy and its aggressive governmental apparatus, strengthened and in part led by ex-Nazi economic, political, and military personnel.

Now, in 1963, France, in close alliance with its erstwhile enemy West Germany, has been cold-shouldering both Britain and the United States to the point at which President de Gaulle has said that Britain was not truly European and that the United States was adventurist and not dependable. Following this press-conference sally, the French President began a vigorous campaign to bring Franco Spain into the bloc headed by France and Germany. If this effort succeeds, Europe will be divided once again into three parts: a west Europe organized around Great Britain and supported by the United States; a central Europe built around the German-French-Spanish axis, with Italy on the sidelines; and an east Europe almost entirely socialist.

While Western diplomacy under State Department leadership was advocating a replica of the power blocs that fought and crippled each other in 1914-1918 and 1939-1945, the encircled socialist areas were developing and expanding at a phenomenal pace. In 1946 only one country was actively building socialism. Today there are a dozen nations committed to planned socialist construction. In 1946 the inhabitants of the socialist bloc numbered less than 200 million. Today they have increased to over a billion people. Eighteen years ago socialist construction had been set back by heavy manpower and material losses of the war years. Socialist construction today is advancing steadily and rapidly.

Secretary Rusk and his White House boss may wish to follow the mirage of destroying Communism, but if the course of history continues during the next 18 years along the lines of the 1945-1963 period, the one remaining capitalist great power (if it can survive economic stagnation, astronomical budget deficits, mounting tax burdens, and crippling debt) will have become little more than a fluttering leaf on the tree of socialism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHERE WE STAND

During the early years of the 20th century the subject of socialism was widely and eagerly discussed in the United States. Eugene V. Debs, socialist candidate for president, polled close to 1,000,000 votes in 1912—the equivalent of approximately 3,000,000 votes in the 1948 election. The popular interest in socialism was reflected in an enormous sale of socialist literature. *The Appeal to Reason,* a weekly, had a circulation of more than 300,000 for several years; pamphlets by Oscar Ameringer were printed in editions of hundreds of thousands; books by Bellamy, Upton Sinclair, and Jack London ranked with the best-sellers of the day.

This widespread interest in socialism has declined to such an extent that today it would probably not be an exaggeration to say that for the great majority of Americans "socialism" is little more than a dirty word. This is an extraordinary situation because it occurs at the very moment that a large proportion of the rest of the world is moving toward socialism at an unprecedentedly rapid rate. It is a deeply disturbing situation because there are still many Americans who believe with us that, in the long run, socialism will prove to be the only solution to the increasingly serious economic and social problems that face the United States.

It is because we hold firmly to this belief that we are founding MONTHLY REVIEW, an independent magazine devoted to analyzing, from a socialist point of view, the most significant trends in domestic and foreign affairs.

By "socialism" we mean a system of society with two fundamental characteristics: first, public ownership of the decisive sectors of the economy, and second, comprehensive planning of production for the benefit of the producers themselves.

The possibility and workability of such a system of society

Reprinted from Vol. I, No. 1 (May, 1949) and the first issue of every subsequent volume.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are no longer open to doubt. Socialism became a reality with the introduction of the First Five Year Plan in Soviet Russia in 1928; its power to survive was demonstrated by the subsequent economic achievements of the USSR during the '30s, and finally, once and for all, in the war against Nazi Germany. These facts —and they are facts which no amount of wishful thinking can conjure away—give to the USSR a unique importance in the development of socialism and in the history of our time.

We find completely unrealistic the view of those who call themselves socialists, yet imagine that socialism can be built on an international scale by fighting it where it already exists. This is the road to war, not to socialism. On the other hand, we do not accept the view that the USSR is above criticism simply because it is socialist. We believe in, and shall be guided by, the principle that the cause of socialism has everything to gain and nothing to lose from a full and frank discussion of shortcomings, as well as accomplishments, of socialist countries and socialist parties everywhere.

We shall follow the development of socialism all over the world, but we want to emphasize that our major concern is less with socialism abroad than with socialism at home. We are convinced that the sooner the United States is transformed from a capitalist to a socialist society, the better it will be, not only for Americans, but for all mankind.

We believe that there are already many Americans who share this attitude with us and that their number will steadily increase. We ask for their financial support, their assistance in extending our circulation, and their advice as to how MONTHLY REVIEW can best serve the cause of socialism in the United States.

Clarity about the aims and problems of socialism is of greatest significance in our age of transition. Since, under present circumstances, free and unhindered discussion of these problems has come under a powerful taboo, I consider the founding of this magazine to be an important public service.

PROFESSOR ALBERT EINSTEIN
in his article "Why Socialism?" in Vol. I, No. 1

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside back cover*)

American universities (the very last institutional vestige of American bourgeois freedom) have now succumbed to suppression and control by the powers that be. It is now a society of total domination."

And yet—no. Not total. You can still fight against it, and we believe that more and more Americans, especially students, are ready to do so.

In another month the vacation period begins and many of you will be changing your address for one or two or three months. We hope you will have the fun and rest you're after—but please, before you go, make sure that *your* vacation will not be *our* headache. It becomes our headache if you don't send *us* your change of address as soon as possible. It is not enough for you to notify the Post Office on the supposition that MR will then be forwarded to you. It will not be. Instead, the Post Office will send us a notice that you have moved (for which we must pay 10¢), then we write you for verification (another 5¢), then we send out the issue again (another 5¢). All this waste of our time and money will be avoided if you will take one minute to send us the following information:

Monthly Review 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

Please send the issues checked below to my summer address

..... June ..... July/August ..... September

Name .....

Summer Address .....

Present Address .....

Please note that there are no reserved seats for the Felix Greene meeting on May 9. So those of you who plan to go should get there early. For details, see box below.

MONTHLY REVIEW ASSOCIATES

joins forces with the National Guardian in its presentation of

FELIX GREENE

writer, lecturer, author of Awakened China

China—An Eyewitness Account

a lecture with slides

Date: THURSDAY, MAY 9 — 8:00 P.M.

Place: TOWN HALL, 113 W. 43rd Street, New York

Admission: Orchestra, $2.50 Balcony, $1.50

Send your order for tickets, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

we specially urge those of you who asked that Carlos Fuentes' article be reprinted to take advantage of these offers? We believe that *Whither Latin America?* is a first-rate introduction to the real problems of that region and that it can be effectively used to promote MR and MR Press books.

Bound copies of MR, Volume 14 (May, 1962-April, 1963) will soon be ready. Price—$10 a copy.

Much to our surprise a reporter for *Business Week* recently came around to interview us, and also Paul Baran on the West Coast, on our ideas about what's wrong with the American economy. And even more to our surprise, the resulting story (*Business Week,* April 13, pp. 67-71) is an evident attempt to be fair and objective. To be sure, the story does contain inaccuracies—which MR readers can easily spot and correct—but they are less important than that the country's leading business weekly should be so much interested in what Marxists have to say about the plight of the economy.

It seems to us that if *Business Week* is interested, many others who have never heard of MR probably would be too. So we have ordered a batch of reprints of the article and will be glad to send copies to any readers who think they can use them to promote MR's circulation—for example, by showing the article to librarians, teachers, or any one worried about what's happening in and to this country.

Richard Gibson asks us to correct an error that slipped into his article, "The Algerian Revolution Begins," in the March issue. On page 617 the amount of land socialized by January, 1963, is stated to be "more than two and a half million acres." This should be hectares, which means about *five and a half million acres.* As of the end of March, incidentally, the figure is up to about 7½ million acres.

A very favorable review of Harvey O'Connor's *World Crisis in Oil* appeared in the January, 1963, issue of the *Monthly Labor Review,* official publication of the U.S. Department of Labor. Concludes Melvin Rothbaum, the reviewer:

"Mr. O'Connor has covered a vast amount of material, much of it secured through personal interviews. His approach is journalistic rather than academic, and his opinions are strong and oft-stated. While one may disagree with various matters of emphasis and interpretation or with the descriptive phrases so freely and pungently employed, he has given us an interesting, useful, and timely view of the world oil industry."

And on April 1, the *Library Journal* distributed to its subscribers one of its regular cards carrying a favorable notice and recommendation of Jackson and Marsden, *Education and the Working Class.*

Brandeis University, for which many people had high hopes, has just been the scene of a shocking violation of the most elementary principles of academic freedom. Kathleen Gough Aberle, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, spoke at a student meeting at the height of the Cuba Crisis last October. She expressed warm sympathy for the Cuban Revolution and revulsion for U.S. policy, saying that if there was an invasion of Cuba she hoped the U.S. would be defeated. Subsequently, she was called in by President Sachar, berated in vulgar terms, and officially reprimanded. Failing to gain redress for this flagrant injustice, Prof. Aberle and her husband, Prof. David Aberle, Chairman of the Anthropology Department, indignantly resigned. The whole story is told in articles, statements, and an editorial in the March 26th issue of *The Justice,* student newspaper. Reading these, we felt a mixture of sorrow and anger in about equal proportions. "It is painfully evident," in the words of a group of graduate students in the History of Ideas Department, "that

(*continued on page* 64)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

Coming in June . . .

WHITHER LATIN AMERICA?

A selection of twelve articles, from the pages of Monthly Review, describing the conditions and analyzing the tensions which make Latin America a continent about to explode.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

1. THE ARGUMENT OF LATIN AMERICA: WORDS FOR THE NORTH AMERICANS by Carlos Fuentes
2. THE PLUNDERED CONTINENT by Paul Johnson
3. THE COMING LATIN AMERICAN REVOLUTION by A Traveling Observer
4. WHICH WAY FOR LATIN AMERICA? by Leo Huberman
5. THE VARIETIES OF LAND REFORM by Andrew Gunder Frank
6. A GREAT AMERICAN by Paul M. Sweezy
7. MEXICO: THE JANUS FACES OF 20th CENTURY BOURGEOIS REVOLUTION by Andrew Gunder Frank
8. VENEZUELA: A STUDY IN IMPERIALISM by Harvey O'Connor
9. BRAZIL, A CHRISTIAN COUNTRY by Francisco Juliao
10. ANDES AND SIERRA MAESTRA by Sebastian Salazar Bondy
11. REPORT FROM ECUADOR by Manuel Agustin Aguirre
12. NOTES ON LATIN AMERICA by Paul M. Sweezy and Leo Huberman

List price: cloth $3 — Prepub price—$2
paperback $1.45 — Prepub price—$1
6 paperbacks — Prepub price—$5

ORDER NOW AND SAVE

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED